

JUL 7 1909

*INDEXED

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy.

LEMOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

PROF. S. A. ORT, D. D., LL. D.

PROF. F. D. ALTMAN, D. D.

PROF. ALFRED HILLER, D. D.

PROF. F. P. MANHART, D. D.

PROF. J. L. NEVE, D. D.

VOL. XXXIX—NO. 3.

JULY, 1909.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1909

CONTENTS

I. OF THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS	301
BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.	
II. THE RELATION OF THE MINISTER TO THE SYNOD.....	334
BY WILLIAM SHINDEL SIGMUND.	
III. THE CENSUS OF QUIRINIUS	358
BY REV. WM. WEBER, PH.D.	
IV. IS HISTORY RATIONAL?	372
BY PROFESSOR CHARLES W. SUPER.	
V. INTERMARRIAGE OF BELIEVERS AND UNBELIEV- ERS.	391
BY REV. A. E. DETZ.	
VI. ORIGINAL SIN.	396
BY REV. SANFORD N. CARPENTER.	
VII. THE JOYS OF THE MINISTRY.	410
BY REV. CHARLES R. TROWBRIDGE.	
VIII. OUR CHURCH SCHOOLS: THEIR OBJECT AND THEIR METHOD.	420
BY PROFESSOR HOLMES DYSINGER, D.D.	
IX. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.	437
The Bible as Good Reading—Mysticisms—A Commentary on the Holy Bible by Various Writers—The Atonement—Quiet Talks with World Winners—The Separated Life—The Christian Philosophy of Life—Luther's Epistle Sermons, Epiphany, Easter and Pentecost— Luther's Small Catechism, Luther's Large Catechism, Luther's Two Catechisms—The Wonderful Story of Life and Death—The Rational Test—Testimonium Animæ—Sacerdotalism in the Nineteenth Cen- tury—The Literary Digest—The Missionary Review of the World.	

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1909.

ARTICLE I.

OF THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.*

BY PROF. J. L. NEVE, D.D.

At first thought it might seem as if the twenty-first Article of the Augustana were one of only minor importance compared with the other articles in the first part of our Confession. Yet we know that Luther at Coburg, who had no direct influence on the shaping of the document, was very much concerned about having an article on the invocation of saints among the confessional statements of the purified Church. Not only do we find an article on that subject in the so-called Torgau Articles in the conception of which Luther must have participated,(1) but we know it also from a letter which he wrote from Coburg to Dr. Jonas in Augsburg. The letter was written on the 21st of July in reply to the information that, after the Confession had been delivered, the Emperor with the Catholic princes and divines had asked the Protestants whether the articles comprised *all* the differences from the Catholic Church, or whether there were more. To this Luther replied in his forceful manner: "I see what this means; the devil is alive yet and it has not escaped

* Lecture on Article XXI of the Augsburg Confession, on the Holman Foundation, delivered in the Theological Seminary, at Gettysburg, Pa., May 4th, 1909.

(1) Theo. Kolde, *Historische Einleitung in die Symbolischen Buecher*, XXI, 10th edition of Mueller.

him that your apology steps softly (*leise tritt*) and that the articles concerning purgatory, invocation of saints, and the Pope as Antichrist have been passed over in silence." (2) But the article on saint-worship *was there*, though not in the copy which was sent him immediately after the delivery of the Confession on June 25th. Kolde thinks Luther might have overlooked in the *second* copy this article which he had missed in the first, which could easily happen because our short twenty-first article almost disappears between the long twentieth and twenty-second. (3) Be that as it may, to us it is of interest that the article for our lecture to-day was wanted by Luther also. It was an important article at that time. And to-day we could not do without it in our Augustana. For even concerning the invocation of saints Roman Catholicism has hardened its heart against the truly evangelical testimony of our fathers, and this testimony of our article must continue as long as such gross error is maintained by Rome and creature is worshipped with the Creator.

Twenty-one years ago this article, the last one in the 1st series, of these lectures, was treated by Dr. J. C. Koller so exhaustively that hardly anything new would be left to say for me if I should lay the main emphasis on the interpretation of the contents of the article. I shall therefore confine myself to the treatment of the article pre-eminently from its historical aspects. Following this method, a discussion of the contents will also appear at the proper place. This article, somewhat like the articles of the second part of our Augustana, dealing with the abuses, can be profitably discussed historically. The line of our discourse is as follows:

I. The gradual growth of saint-worship and the form of this error at the eve of the Reformation.

II. Luther's development regarding the invocation of saints and how Melancthon framed the result of it in our article.

III. Our article in the fire of Roman criticism and how it was defended.

At the close we shall have a brief discussion of the very inter-

(2) De Wette, *Luther's Briefe* iv. 110, Enders, *Briefwechsel* viii, 133.

(3) *Comp. Theo.* Kolde, "Einleitung" to Mueller's *Symb.* Books p. IX.; also Kolde, *Aelteste Redaktion der Augsburgischen Confession* pp. 68-69, 74.

esting transition from the first to the second part of our Confession.

I.

Inquiring into the beginnings of saint-worship in the Church we have to go far back into antiquity, yet not quite as far as many historians of the Roman Catholic Church would like to have us believe. It has been asserted that already in the apostolic church there were those who as "saints" occupied a special position in the congregation.(4) But this evidently is a misapprehension of *ἅγιοι* as used in the New Testament in the Acts and in the Epistles of St. Paul. According to Paul's conception all Christians are saints.(5)

Yet soon a distinction began to be made between common Christians and such as had attained a higher degree of sanctity. As such the martyrs were regarded. Whole congregations celebrated the memory of those of their number who had died as witnesses of their Lord. Their remains, regarded as the sanctified organs of sainted souls, were carefully buried, the anniversaries of their deaths were observed with the Holy Communion as birthdays for the blessed life into which they had entered.(6) But there was yet no invocation of these saints.

Chemitz regarded Origen as the first to sow the seed of real saint-worship. In the third Homily to the Song of Solomon, he writes: "All saints that have departed from this life have yet love towards those who are left in the world. When we, therefore, say that they care for us and support us with their prayers and intercession before God, then we express no improper thought." For proof he quotes the apocryphal passage in the 2nd Book of Maccabees, chapter 15, the 14th verse: "This is Jeremiah, etc., and prays continually for the people and the holy city." This passage is a perverted reminiscence of Jeremiah 18:20 where it reads: "Remember that I stood before thee to speak good for them and to turn away thy wrath from

(4) For instance Manchet, *Die Heiligen*.

(5) Acts 9:13, 32. Rom. 1:7; 16:2, 15. 1 Cor. 6:1s, 14:34; 2 Cor. 1:1, etc. Comp. Bonwetsch in *Realencyclopaedie*, 3 edit., VII., 554.

(6) Neander, *Allg. Gesch. d. christl. Rel. u. Kirche* (1st Ed.) I., 596.

them." (7) Yet Origen desires his view to be regarded as a private opinion only; it has no claim as an article of faith. For in his explanation of the letter to the Romans (second book), he calls it a mystery of God of which we have no sure revelation.

But at that age the soil was very receptive for seed like that contained in the remarks of Origen. The veneration of the martyrs was rising. Especially since Christianity had ascended the throne of the Roman empire, the glory fell upon those who had secured the victory with their blood. Basil and the two Gregorys especially brought the invocation of saints into the services of the Church. Basil the Great in his Eulogy upon one of the forty soldiers who died under Julian as martyrs says: "You have often wanted to find one who would pray for you to God; here are forty unitedly calling upon God for you," etc. He exclaims: "O ye united protectors of mankind, ye excellent co-partners of our cares, ye helpmates of our prayers, ye powerful supporters!" (8) In his tribute to Basil, Gregory Nazianzen says: "Now he is in heaven, now he is offering for us, now he prays for the people." And in his memorial upon Athanasius, he calls upon the deceased in expressions of prayer, mercifully to look down upon us from heaven. (9) Even Chrysostom, otherwise more cautious on this point, says in his praise of two confessors: "Let us call upon them to intercede for us." (10) Augustine warned against worshipping dead men. The saints were to be worshipped by imitating their lives, not by adoring them, and all our praising them must be directed to God; nevertheless in his eucharist offerings he also called upon the saints in prayer. (11) Even ordeals did he expect from them. Harnack tells the following story: Two clerics are suspected in a case of ravishing. Both deny their guilt. But it must have been one of them. Augustine sends them over the sea to the grave of the Saint, Paulin of Nola. Their they shall repeat their as-

(7) Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, Edition of Benedixen and Luthardt, p. 396.

(8) Boussnet-Cramer, *Einleitung in d. Gesch. d. Welt u. d. Rel.* IV, p. 341.

(9) Chemnitz *ut supra* p. 339.

(10) Boussnet-Cramer 356.

(11) Bonwetsch in *R. E.* VII, 556.

sertions. He expects that the saint will punish the liar immediately. (12)

The saints to whom now many are added that did not die as martyrs, but were distinguished for holiness of life, or great works in the Church are multiplying rapidly. Soon also the worship of Mary is started. That her worship had not arisen earlier was because she was no martyr. But since this was not necessary anymore, her prestige soon grew even above that of common saints, because she, like her Son, could claim an ascension into heaven. Thus she had been received into the sphere of the Deity and could claim special veneration (*ὑπερδουλία*) (13)

Of the degree of adoration of the saints we can judge from the appreciation of relics. The most illumined spirits of the age try one to outdo the other in glorifying the relics of the saints. To a Gregory the Great the miracles of these relics are daily occurrences. "The miraculous power of some is so great that every one dies who touches them. . . . What powerful intercessors and advocates the saints must be if even their bodies can do such things!" (14)

But already at such an early age the growing invocation of saints did not remain without protest. Already the bishop Epiphanius had protested by enumerating this worship among the eighty heresies of which his main work treats. (15) Much more decided was the protest of the Gallican priest Vigilantius of Barcelona, at the end of the fourth century. He denied the effect of the prayers of the saints, because they were not yet with Christ in heaven. He called those who worked them worshippers of ashes and of idols. (16) But he was passionately opposed by Jerome who already then argued exactly as the Roman Catholics do to-day: "If the apostles and martyrs already in this life, before their struggle was finished, were able to pray for others, how much more can they do it now since they have attained to victory!" (17)

The number of saints grew and the confidence in them in-

(12) A. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte* II, 447.

(13) Kattenbusch, *Vergleichende Konfessions-Kunde* I, 464 s.

(14) Harnack III, 239.

(15) Chemnitz 339.

(16) Harnack II, 449.

(17) Neander II, 724.

creased. At the second synod of Nicea (787), their invocation was officially sanctioned. True, it was declared that a distinction should always be made between *λατρεία* (worship, adoration) which belongs to God only, and *τιμή* (honor, veneration) which may be given to the saints, and which is to find expression in *προσκύνησις* (kneeling) and *ἐπικλήσις* (invocation.) But this is an academic distinction which, as a rule, is not made by the common people.

To understand this growing need for an olympus of saints, let us recall the spiritual condition of the peoples since the final overthrow of heathenism. We can imagine how hard it must have been for the peoples east and west, for the civilized Romans as well as the uncivilized Barbarians, who all had been accustomed to a multitude of Gods and demi-gods, now at once to feel entirely at home in Christian monotheism. Says Karl August von Hase: "Inside of a monotheistic religion the worship of saints has satisfied a polytheistic need by bridging over the immense distance between man and God." (18) Yes, the roots of saint-worship have grown in pagan soil. This has been observed by our reformers and by many scholars. (19)

Among the saints of the Catholic Church there are a great many who never lived. Thus, for instance, St. Christophorus represents nothing but a beautiful legend of the powerful giant who as a ferry man took wanderers upon his shoulders over the swiftly flowing stream. "Once at the dawn of day he carried a little boy over the torrent and in the midst of the stream he sighs: "It is only a child and yet I feel as if I was carrying the whole world!" "Yes, you are carrying the Saviour of the world," was the reply of the child, who gave him Christian baptism." (20) So everybody must become a Christophorus, that is, a Christ-bearer. This is the beautiful application. Here the poetry reconciles us with the superstition.—Less attractive is the blood-miracle of the mythological saint, Januarius, in the cathedral of Naples. It is claimed that he died as a martyr under Diocletian. A matron had caught his blood in two vessels.

(18) Hase, *Handbuch der protestantischen Polemik* 307.

(19) Bonwetsch, *R. E. VII*, 555. Harnack *II*, 448. Schultz, *Geschichte des Untergangs des griechisch-romischen Heidentums II*, 351.

(20) Hase 295.

This blood preserved in two lumps by the authorities of the Cathedral turns into fluid three times a year, provided the saint be favorably disposed to the people in Naples. When the performance is to take place the "service" is always connected with much excitement. Should the miracle only for a moment be delayed, the attendants begin to lament, to scold and to curse; but when the black lumps of blood suddenly melt and bubble red, then the people break into wild expressions of joy. In either case it increases the influence of the clergy over the people.. Just recently two chemists, Dr. Nicollo de Colli and Dr. Sino Magarini, have shown in public demonstrations in Rome, Florence, Livorno and Milan how this miracle is performed. The glass vessels used for the experiment is exactly similar in form to that in the cathedral in Naples; it is bellied. Placed between four burning candles, the black blood soon begins to bubble and to throw a red foam. Dr. Margarini who poured the fluid before the eyes of all on a plate announced the analysis as follows: 50 grams blood of a mammal, 15 grams itiocolla, 2 grams agar-agar and 1 gram glycerine.

But as a rule the saints of the Catholic Church are historical. Since the tenth century they have been officially canonized. Up to that time the Christian people had created saints as a nation to-day in its mysterious, unconscious power distinguishes a certain monarch as "the Great," if such surname really is to be the final verdict of history. Now the Pope received the right to create the saints of the Church. Inasmuch as he was acknowledged the door-keeper of heaven it seemed to come within his jurisdiction to declare who is a saint and fit to be called on by the prayers of the Church.(21) By degrees canonization has come to be a very circumstantial process. If someone cannot without opposition be declared a saint he is first beatified which as a rule can not be done until fifty years after his death. The investigations must show that he was a man of heroic virtues and especially of miraculous powers. Of what kind, however, such miracles are, is illustrated by a report for which the "Allg. Ev. Luth. Kirchenzeitung" is authority. Proceedings are going on in Rome for the purpose of creating Pope Pius IX a saint. The evidences of

(21) Hase 297.

his sanctity have been collected and presented before the spiritual tribunal which recently published the result of its investigations. Among the miracles the following are reported as resting upon absolute reliable testimony: A woman in France suffering with a painful trouble in her foot was cured by coming in contact with a stocking of the late Pope. Another woman who had been blind for years received her sight by applying a piece of cloth that had covered his dead body. A lady suffering from a terrible kind of neuralgia in her face was cured by tying a slipper of the Pope around her stomach.—In his work of canonizing, the Pope is assisted by committees; but when all such preliminaries are finished, he gives his declaration *ex cathedra*, as unfailing divine truth. At this ceremony the Pope or his representative reads the high-mass in St. Peter's. Paintings announce the meritorious works and the miracles of the new aristocrat of heaven, and he who up to this time has been prayed for is now for the first time addressed by the Vicar of Christ with the words: *Ora pro nobis*. Of course, says Hase, this performance "costs more than the promotion of a doctor's degree, but the raising of such large sums of money indicates the interest that a family, a corporation, a city, a province, takes in the acknowledgement of the candidate and consequently will take in his invocation." (22) But stop and think! The popes have sometimes wanted to create a saint and could not do it for political considerations. For instance in the case of Bellarmin, France and Spain protested, and the idea had to be abandoned. So our Lord was deprived of a member of his court, because the Pope happened to have to reckon with influences in the cabinets of Spain and France. (23)

From 1500 to 1881, 96 persons were declared saints and 320 were beatified. Of these 358 were men and 58 women. 259 of them were martyrs. In respect to nationality Italy was represented with 76, Spain with 66, Portugal with 37 and Germany with only 4! (24)

But we shall be especially interested in finding out how saint-worship was practiced at the time when the Reformers rose and

(22) Hase 298. Comp. Realencyclopaedie I, 19.

(23) Comp. Hase 299.

(24) Meusel, Kirchliches Handlexikon, III, 213.

the Augsburg Confession gave its testimony against it. For in finally formulating her doctrine at the council of Trent, the Roman Catholic Church has taken special pains in speaking about saint-worship in such a manner as to exclude much of what we are accustomed to include in the description of her practice. And Roman historians like Jansen in his "*Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters*," (25) have found a pleasure in stating that already at the time preceding the Reformation saint-worship was neither in doctrine nor practice corrupt. (26) The religious literature of the age, Jansen assures us, taught, "in struggle with death to rely upon nothing else but the merits of Jesus Christ." (27) So then, there was no call for the twenty-first article of our Confession? The famous work of Jansen called forth many a reply from the quarters of Protestantism. A few articles containing a very thorough refutation were written by Prof. G. Kawerau (at that time pastor at Klemzig) in Luthardt's "*Zeitschrift fuer kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben*" (1882). Only a few testimonies from these articles and some other sources shall be quoted to show that at the time of the Reformation a worship of saints was in vogue which made it a duty for the Reformers, here also to lift their voice in earnest protest.

In the *Novum beatae Mariae psalterium*, printed in the 15th century, the birth of the blessed Virgin is announced to her father with the words: "*A child is given you, the star of Jacob.*" There she is represented as distributing manna among the believers and at the foot of the picture we read: "*To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna.*" There she is praised: "*Thou, Mary, art the strong anchor of the ship of the Church, the harbor of forgiveness, the door of salvation, the giver of all strength.*" (28) The eloquence of the sermonizers begins as soon as Mary is the subject of preaching. Here a sentence from the *Euagatorium* of 1503: "*There is nothing that more fills my heart with pleasure and with awe than when I am*

(25) 3 vol., Freiburg in Baden.

(26) Jansen, I, 42.

(27) I, 35.

(28) Kawerau 269.

to preach on the glory of the Virgin." (29) Another example from the printed sermons of one noted for his great earnestness in preaching repentance: "If all these things do not appeal to thy sinful heart and cannot lead thee to repentance and to better thy life, then, I pray thee, go to the last source out of which flows all sweetness of grace. It is the Virgin, the queen of heaven, Mary, the mother and giver of all grace. And then say to her: O Mary, thou fountain of grace, I poor sinner pray thee by thy merits to secure for me the mercy and favor of thy dear child. My sin prevents me from coming to true sorrow and repentance, this alone can be wrought in me by thy intercession and grace." (30) Mary has completely displaced Jesus as the friend and Saviour of sinners. He is looked upon as the stern judge who can not be approached without the mediation of his kind-hearted mother. Mary has undertaken all functions of the Saviour, she is the center of all devotion.

One only needs to recall the revival of the worship of Saint Anna during the decade preceding the Reformation period. Not only the monks, but also the most illumined spirits of the age spend their energy in the new worship. Everywhere chapels and altars are erected to her honor. The popes, Sixtus IV, and Alexander VI, issue formulas for her invocation. Alexander VI promised "Xtusend Jar ablass toetlicher sünd und xtusend Jar lasslicher sünd" to all who would three times say a certain prayer before a painting of Saint Anna. (31)

This was in Germany, but in other countries we meet the same views. For instance England had the worship of Saint Thomas a Becket. Instead of multiplying examples I call attention to a liturgy which was generally in use at the end of the fifteenth century. (32) In the 9th section of the first formula we read: "At the cry of his blood the earth was moved and trembled. Nay, moreover, the powers of the heavens were moved; so that, as if for the avenging of innocent blood, nation rose against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; nay kingdom was divided

(29) p. 271.

(30) P. 275. Quotation from: "Spiegel aller Liebhaber der Welt."

(31) P. 274. Comp. Kawerau, "Caspar Guettel" 16-20. W. Schneegans, "Abt. J. Trithemius," 216-221. Hortulus Anime, Bl. 137 b.

(32) Primitive Worship, edited by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, p. 201.

against itself; and terrors from heaven and great signs took place. Yet from the first period of his martyrdom the martyr began to shine forth with miracles, restoring sight to the blind, walking to the lame, hearing to the deaf, language to the dumb; afterwards cleansing the lepers, making the paralytic sound, healing the dropsy and all kinds of incurable diseases, restoring the dead to life, in a wonderful manner commanding the devils and all the elements." There the martyr of Hildebrandism is invoked: "O Thomas! Thou rod of justice! The brightness of the world! The strength of the Church! The lover of the people! The delight of the clergy! Glorious guardian of the flock! Save thou those who delight in thy glory!" Then turning to Christ the liturgy continues: "O Christ Jesus, by the wounds of Thomas, loosen the sins which bind us." And again: "O blessed Jesus, by the merits of Thomas, forgive us our debts, raise us from the three-fold death." And: "Do thou, O Christ, by the blood of Thomas, which he shed for Thee, cause us to ascend whither Thomas has ascended." Then again turning directly to the saint who is considered a mediator between God and man: "For thy sake, O Thomas, let the right hand of God embrace us!" All divine gifts are expected of the saint: "Send help to us, O Thomas, guide thou those who stand. Raise up those who fall. Correct our morals, actions and life. Guide us unto the way of peace." (33)

Of special interest is the theory that had been invented, according to which each saint was given a special sphere for help and benefaction. Saint Anna had power against pestilence, Saint Brigitta to bestow health in general. Prof. v. Gorichen in Colongne taught that St. Anthony could help against inflammation of the body, St. Cornelius had power over fits, St. Agathe over fire. The prayerbooks of that time show us a long row of such special helpers. Against pestilence also Rochus and Sebastian will help, against the fits also Valentine, Apollonia against smallpox, in fever Saint Siegmund, in eye troubles Otilie. An interesting group of special helpers is given by Chemnitz: St. Martin and St. George help the Germans, St. Peter and St. Paul

(33) Comp. "What is Romanism?" London 1846. Society for the Prom. of Chr. Knowl. Especially the third tract: "The Invocation of Saints."

the Romans, St. James is the patron of Spain, etc. The sailors call on St. Nicholas, the painters on St. Luke, the shoemakers on St. Krispin, the tailors on St. Guttman. St. Gallus protects the geese. St. Wendelin the sheep, St. Eulogius the horses, St. Anthony the pigs." (34)

Such was the invocation of Saints when the Reformation began. No wonder, therefore that it was felt necessary to have in the Augsburg Confession, an article with statements on that point. This takes us to the second part of our discourse where we still try to trace *the growing convictions of our reformers on this question* and see how they expressed them in our twenty-first article.

We all know that Luther's theological development was gradual. Yet we are instinctively inclined to suppose that in a question like the invocation of saints which to-day seems to us so absurd, his conviction had been complete from the beginning. But this is even here not the case. Luther confessed later of himself: "It has been hard to me beyond measure to give up the saints; denn ich ueber alle Massen tief darinnen gesteckt und ersoffen gewest bin." (35)

In his exposition of the tenth commandment (1516) he said: "All saints can do all things and they will give us according to our faith." (36) He even respects the idea that each saint has a special sphere in which he can help; yet he adds: "It does not come within your province arbitrarily to distribute offices among the saints." (37) Object of highest veneration is to him the Virgin Mary. He addresses her as the blessed Mother, the most worthy Virgin, imploring her to remember us and to influence the Lord to do for us also the great things which he has done for her." (38) In his "Sermon on the Preparation for Dying," he admonishes "to invoke the Mother of God, all apostles and the dear saints that faith and understanding of the sacraments be

(34) Chemnitz ut supra p. 386. Comp. also Luther's exposition of the first commandment (1516) in the edition of Luther's works by Kawerau and others VII, pp. 72-82 and 89. Kawerau ut supra, p. 278 et seq. Chytraeus, Historia der Augsb. Confession p. 2. Mueller, Symb. Books p. 228.

(35) Erl. Ed. LXV, 120.

(36) Ed. of Kawerau and others VII, 85.

(37) P. 85.

(38) Loescher Reformations-Akten I, 201.

created in us." Yea, we should "pray to God and his saints all our life for real faith in the last hour." (39)

His doubts begin with inquiring whence the Pope takes the authority to create saints. (40) In his plea to the German nobility (1520) he exclaims: "I wished they would leave the dear saints in peace and not mislead the people. What spirit has given the Pope power to raise saints? Who tells him whether they are saints or not? Are there not sins enough in the world that one should tempt God, interfere with his judgment and use them as means of making money?" (41)

Luther is now rapidly approaching the position of our article in the Augsburg Confession. In the exposition of the Magnificat (1521) he says of Mary, the Queen of Heaven: "She is not a goddess, to bestow gifts or help. She gives nothing, but God alone gives." (42) And in his German Church Postil, preaching upon the Epistle for the second Sunday in Advent, he warns against any worshipping of saints in which the worshipper does not press on into the presence of God himself. He filled with anxiety lest an abominable idolatry may by such means be introduced. (43) He grants that some employ the worship of saints and of the Mother of God in a proper spirit. Nevertheless, it seems to him to be a dangerous custom, which should not be observed in the general congregation. (44) Though there were nothing wrong in the practice otherwise, it seems to him at the outset a suspicious circumstance that it has the support of no scriptural test or example, but that it rather contradicts those passages which teach us to place all our confidence in God. (45) Luther, therefore, accords at once in principle with the Wittenberg agitators, who wished to have saint-worship entirely abandoned. It would have been his desire, indeed, that this question might be allowed to rest for a while, since its agitation was not

(39) Erl. Ed. XXI, 272.

(40) Loescher III, 887. Comp. also Luther's notes on the canonization of Bishop Benno of Meissen. Kawerau's Ed. IV, 75 seq.

(41) As "Geld-Kutzen;" some editions have "Geldgoetzen." Comp. edition of Dr. Kuhn in L. Heilmann's Historische-Politische Bibliothek p. 39.

(42) Erl. Ed. XIV, 251.

(43) Erl. Ed. VII, 66.

(44) Ibid. 67.

(45) Ibid. 66.

a pressing necessity, and Satan was already trying by useless questions to draw the attention of men away from faith and love. If it be only once established that saint-worship is nothing, it will fall into disuse without any special additional effort upon our part, and Christ will then remain alone upon Tabor. This, says Luther, was his own experience; he does not know how or when he ceased to address prayers to the saints, contenting himself with the one Christ and God the Father.(46) Yet in this year of decision for Luther (1522) we notice in him a certain irresolution, for in a sermon upon the day of John the Baptist he granted that one might say to such a saint as Peter, "Pray for me," and only advised that it would be better to address one's self to Christ alone, inasmuch as the Scriptures say nothing about such a prayer as the one mentioned, and we are only thereby led into a whole series of fruitless and improper questions concerning the condition of departed saints.(47) We see that Luther has already begun to think about the question whether the departed saints can take any notice at all of the prayers of the living. Now his convictions are soon settled. In 1523 he expresses his decided approbation of the Bohemian Brethren for their course in not calling upon Mary and the saints, but resting content in Christ.(48) He insists that saint-worship should no longer find a place in the prayers and hymns of the Church.(49) How Luther thought of praying to the saints at the time when our Augustana article was written (1530) we know from a writing which he sent from Coburg.(50)

The Papists had, as Luther here asserts, now been led to realize the abomination resulting from making gods of the saints. They were secretly "drawing in their horns" upon that theme and parading about with their *intercession* of the saints. But of this, too, he will hear nothing further; for *since it is not becoming in us to undertake anything in the worship of God without a commandment of God*, and such undertaking, if made, is a tempting of God, therefore we should not advise or teach men

(46) De Wette, Briefe II, 145, 188, 203 sq. Koestlin, Theology of Luther I, 466 sq.

(47) Erl. Ed. XV, 35.

(48) Erl. Ed. XXVIII, 415.

(49) De Wette II, 289.

(50) Vom Dollmetschen und Fuerbitte der Heiligen. Erl. Ed. LXV, 119 sqq.

to invoke the intercession of deceased saints, nor to teach others to do so, but we should, on the contrary, condemn the practice and teach men to avoid it. The light of the Gospel is now so widely diffused that henceforth no one who remains in darkness can have any excuse. He adds that there is in such worship the further danger and offense, that the people may become accustomed to place their confidence in the saints instead of in Christ. This offense, in view especially of the weakness of the people, so easily mislead, he will not endure. Nature is at any rate only too much inclined to flee from God and place its confidence in men. We dare not paint the devil above the doorway.(51)

We have endeavored to trace the development of Luther's convictions concerning saint-worship up to the Diet at Augsburg. Melancthon, who later wrote so often on this subject, was comparatively silent concerning it before the twenty-first article of the Augustana was formulated. We find nothing on this subject in the first edition of the Loci.(52) Neither in the first volume of the Corpus Reformation which contains his correspondence during the period before the Augsburg Diet. This is not surprising. For the pioneer in breaking down the bulwarks of darkness was Luther. Melancthon follows him ever busy to put into proper form the great thoughts of his genial friend. Guericke calls Melancthon the "female principle of the Reformation." And the old German rhyme, "Was der Martin kuehn begonnen, hat der Philipp fein ersonnen und in rechten Schick gebracht" expresses the true relation between these two great men. So we are justified in supposing that Melancthon's development concerning saint-worship was practically the same as that of Luther.

In the Torgau Articles which must have been written in March 1530 as a preparation for the Diet at Augsburg we find in the ninth article a confessional statement on the attitude of our reformers towards saint-worship.(53) That this statement is found in the *Torgau Articles* on the basis of which Melancthon has written the second part of the Augsburg Confession treating

(51) Koestlin-Hay I, 468.

(52) Comp. Die Loci, etc., in ihrer Urgestalt herausgegeben von Plitt.

(53) Foerstemann. Urkundenbuch I, 82. Kolde Augsb. Conf. mit Reliquen p. 139 Dr. Jacob's Book of Concord II, 85.

of the abuses *and not in the Schwabach Articles* which have served as a basis for the twenty-one articles representing the doctrinal statements of the young Lutheran Church, suggests to us a question which has often been raised, namely: Whether our twenty-first article really ought not to have been put into the *second* division of the Augustana. At first thought it seems to deal more with an abuse than with a positive doctrine of the Church. We know that this article was about the last that was incorporated in the Confession. It was not yet written when Luther received the first copy on May 11th.(54) This late drafting of our article may indicate that at first Melancthon and his advisers were undecided. Finally the article received its place as the last in the first part of the confession. Dr. Loy in his exposition of the Augustana, recently published, writes: "Apparently its appropriate place would be in the second division. But on more mature reflection its importance as an article of our faith becomes apparent." (55) The positive confessional thought is this that under all circumstances we depend directly on Christ and that any human mediation is excluded. As in the twentieth article the meritorious character of our works is denied, so here the Scriptural ground for human mediators and intercessors. Says Dr. Loy: "Many romantic poets and sentimental followers of romantic dreams, have been guided by the sophistry and sentimentality of the papistic pleas and pageants, and have found reason in heathenish and spiritualistic intercourse with the dead." (56) And then the importance which the Roman Catholic Church attached to this doctrine may have also contributed to the decision to give to our article exactly the place which it occupies. We only need to recall the fact that the attack which Eck had published against the Protestants in order to prejudice the Emperor and members of the Diet against them contained the enumeration of the sixteen errors concerning the saints.(57)

Now, before we undertake to present the contents of the article yet a few remarks. If we compare with our *textus receptus* in the Book of Concord the text (German and Latin) as

(54) Kolde, *Älteste Redaktion* 69, 74. Comp. 16.

(55) Dr. Loy. *The Augsburg Confession*, 878.

(56) pg. 898.

(57) Eck. 404 articuli, B. 3 a. art., 112-127.

it, according to the recent investigations of Prof. Tschackert in Goettingen, must have read when delivered to the Emperor, then we are able to state that there is an almost perfect harmony between both. (58) In the concluding words only, in the translation from the first to the second division there is in the Latin text an important deviation of which we will speak at the close of our lecture; but in German and Latin we can read the article proper, that is the article as far as it treats of the Invocation of Saints, with the satisfaction of knowing that the texts which we have in the Book of Concord agree almost word for word with the texts delivered at Augsburg.

The positive part of the Latin article reads as follows: "De cultu sanctorum docent, quod memoria sanctorum proponi potest, ut imitemur fidem eorum et bona opera juxta vocationem, ut Caesar imitari potest exemplum Davidis in bello gerendo ad depellendos Turcas a patria. Nam uterque rex est." Translated into English: "Concerning the invocation of saints our churches teach that the saints may be held in remembrance, in order that we may, each in his own calling, imitate their faith and good works just as that the emperor may imitate the example of David in carrying on war to expel the Turks from the country; for each of them is king."

Two things are here stated as belonging to the true veneration of saints, namely, first, that they may be held in remembrance and, second, that their example of good works should be imitated. The ninth of the Torgau Articles had expressed the same thoughts with the following words: "We teach the saints that their example of faith is profitable for us in order to strengthen our faith and for the purpose that we may remember their good works in order to imitate them, each according to his calling. (59) In the Saxonian Unterricht der Visitatoren we read: "This is the proper veneration of saints that we know that their lives have been put before us as reflectors of divine grace and mercy. We honor them also by exercising their faith and practicing their good works. (60) And in the Apology Melancthon elu-

(58) Comp. Tschackert, *Die unveraenderte Augsb. Konfession. Der Kritische Text* pp. 114-116.

(59) Kolde, *Augsb. Konf. m. Beilagen*, 139. Dr. Jacob's *Book on Concord* II, 85.

(60) Richter, *Evang. Kirchenordnungen* I, 94.

culated the wording of the Confession with the following more amplified statement: "Our Confession approves honors to the saints. For here a three-fold honor is to be approved. The *first* is thanksgiving. For we ought to give thanks to God because he has shown examples of mercy; because he has shown that he wishes to save men: because he has given teachers or other gifts to the Church. And these gifts as they are the greatest, should be amplified, and the saints themselves should be praised who have faithfully used these gifts, just as Christ praises faithful business-men. (Matt. 22:21, 23.) The *second* service is the strengthening of our faith; when we see the denial forgiven Peter, we also are encouraged to believe the more that grace truly superabounds over sin. (Rom. 5:20.) The *third* honor is the imitation first of faith, then of the other virtues, which every one should imitate according to his calling." (61)

It sounds somewhat strange to our ears to-day that in a question like saint-worship our article does not rather *begin with objections* against the gross error of the Roman Church, but first states in the form of a confession in how far the Lutherans also teach a veneration of the saints. This finds its explanation in the eagerness of our confessors as much as possible to satisfy the Emperor and all who at Augsburg were guarding the integrity of the traditional doctrine. Later in the *Repetitio Confessionis Augustanae* Melancthon reversed the order, first refuting the errors and at the close admitting what kind of honoring the saints could be acknowledged as agreeing with the Scriptures. (62) And yet it might be regarded as providential and suggestive of an important truth that our article should be composed just as it is. Hase makes the remark: "The Protestant peoples have almost completely lost the memory of the saints with the exception, perhaps, of a few whose names we are accustomed to associate with the weather like Pancratius and Servatius who even commanded the respect of a Frederick the Great since his orangery which was put out too early had been destroyed by the frost. With the memory of the saints has to a large extent also the reminiscence of the ages before the Reformation

(61) Dr. Jacobs, Book of Concord I, 235. Mueller 223.

(62) Corp. Ref. 28, 559, seq.

died out." (63) Yet a more vivid memory of many true saints of the ancient and middle ages would prove a valuable stimulus also for our congregations of the Church of the Reformation.

This, indeed, leads us to a discrimination which we must keep in mind in order to understand our article. By a "saint" the Catholics do not understand exactly the same as we do. Dr. Loy says correctly: "Their ideas are part of their work-righteous system. A saint with them is primarily a man whose personal holiness distinguishes him from the common mass of Christian people and whose powers are therefore marked by miraculous performances." (64) Dr. Pieper says drastically: "Many papistic saints have been such as on their own works wanted to ascend into heaven and who with this venture have plunged into hell, granted that in their dying moments by the grace of God they had forsaken their false way." (65) From Hase we quote the following remarks: "Those saints with their superfluous works, with their eccentric virtues and unnatural denials have lured many a noble soul away from the natural path of simple duty and have helped to obscure the highest ethical ideal in the imitation of Christ." (66) When, for instance, the saint, Crispinus wanted to donate a pair of shoes which he did not possess, he went and stole them from a shoemaker. (67) Among those canonized by the Pope there are many—and these are in the estimation of the Catholic Church the greatest—who have suffered and done much, but ignored the common duties which their God-given relation to family and state had enjoined on them. In a letter of Mrs. Gottfried Kinkel from her exile in London we find the following words: "It seems to be only a sublime egotism if someone wants to do simply his duty. No, the highest grade of noble-mindedness consists in this with painful sacrifice to deny oneself even the pleasure of doing one's duty in order to work for higher ideas." To this Hase remarks sarcastically: "Rather than to do their duty some people with a doubtful code of ethics prefer to do *more* than their duty." (68) Real saints ac-

(63) Polemik, 305.

(64) P. 881.

(65) F. Pieper, *Das Grundbekenntnis* II, 43.

(66) Polemik 307.

(67) Sommer, *Deutsche Frömmigkeit in 13. Jahrhundert*, p. 8

(68) p. 307.

according to the conception of our Church are those who as poor sinners wanted to be saved only by the merits of Christ, but whose gratefulness to God for what he through Jesus has done for our redemption manifested itself in striving after a holiness which had its sole guide in the revealed Word of God. Such as have preserved to the end and with all that they by the grace of God have been permitted to attain in holiness of life and in work for the Church never lost themselves in work-righteousness, such are the saints that we, according to our article, must remember and whose example we ought to imitate.

Now follows the negative part of the article: "*Sed scriptura non docet invocare sanctos, seu petere axilium a sanctis, quia unum Christum nobis proponit mediatorem, propitiatorium, pontificem et intercessorem. Hic invocandus est et promissit se exauditurum esse preces nostra, et hunc cultum maxime probat, videlicet, ut invocetur in omnibus afflictionibus. Si quis peccat, habemus advocatum apud Deum,*" etc. In English: But Scripture does not teach us to invoke saints or to seek aid from them. For it proposes Christ to us as our only Mediator, Propitiation, High Priest, and Intercessor. On Him we are to call, and He promises that he will hear our prayers, and highly approves of this worship, viz: that he should be called upon in every affliction. (John 2): "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, etc."

There are two principal thoughts expressed in this paragraph: the invocation of the saints has no foundation in Scripture, and Jesus alone is our Mediator.

1st. Invocation of saints has no foundation in the Scriptures. *Sed scriptura non docet invocare sanctos seu petere axilium a sanctis.* This negative form of rejecting the Roman error shows again the conciliatory ("leise treten") character of the Augsburg Confession. The language of Luther in the Smalcald Articles sounds different. "The invocation of saints is also one of the abuses of Antichrist." (69)

Luther's doubts in the invocation of saints had begun with the observation that not a single clear passage of Scripture could be quoted in favor of it. It is uncertain, and because the command

to address our prayers to God and Christ is so emphatic therefore we shall prefer the certain to the uncertain. (70) This is also the underlying thought in the passage quoted from our article. But although the rejection of saint-worship here is not literally expressed yet this is the leading thought of the whole article; so when it was said that the saints shall only be remembered and their *example imitated*, so also when it is said secondly that Christ *alone* is our Mediator, Propitiation, High Priest, and Intercessor. Notice the words "*unum Christum*" and the repetition of the word "*einiger*" in the German text, and even for a third time we read in the German, that Christ "*allein*" has promised to hear us. It is wonderful how Melancthon has understood, in mild form to give us a confession that after all is lacking neither in comprehensiveness nor definiteness!

Christ alone our Mediator and Intercessor! Dr. Loy says: "For a complete understanding of our confession it must be kept in mind that the great struggle of the Reformation was to maintain the glory of Christ as the Mediator between God and man and as the Redeemer of the world, as against the Antichristian usurpation of the Pope and the consequent papal decrees founded on such usurped authority. Rome never was fully conscious of the depths of human depravity and never fully appreciated the heights of divine grace and the magnitude of the work of redemption through our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore it could extol human merit where it should magnify divine mercy, and could give honors to Mary that belong only and entirely to our Lord, and teach and practice the invocation of saints instead of calling on the name of the Lord. That is the error that was especially heinous in the eyes of the Reformers, and that is the point to which our article directs principal attention. Christ is to be invoked, not creatures who can not help us in our sin and distress." (71) No matter what the defenders of Roman Catholicism may adduce as justification; that in the saints Christ himself is honored because they are only reflectors of his glory; that their invocation is not compulsory but only an advice (Moehler): all this can not reconcile us to the practice. Such

(70) Erl. Ed. LXV, 119 sqq.

(71) P. 887.

academic distinction does not ameliorate the error and the abuses in the least. In the life of the congregations the worship of Christ and the invocation of saints will always be practiced in such a way that there is no essential difference between the two. Traveling in Roman Catholic countries we will find sufficient proof for this assertion.(72)

III.

Our article in the fire of Roman criticism and how it was defended:

Among the articles of the Augsburg Confession the Papists were especially opposed to this 21st. For saint-worship was a very important stone in the hierachical structure. It belonged to the prerogatives of the Pope to create saints and their service was the means of a rich income to the Church. This article was, therefore, attacked by the composers of the "Confutation" with very much emphasis. Melanchthon begins his reply in the Apology with these words: "The twenty-first article they absolutely condemn, because we do not require the invocation of saints. Nor on any topic do they rhetoricate with more prolixity." (73) The review of this article in the confutation covers more space than any other concerning the articles of the 1st Part of the Augustana. But here especially, the argumentation is so weak that it can serve as an explanation of the report among the Catholics themselves that the reading of the Confutation had been accompanied by the loud derision of the Protestants.(74)

The confuters begin their review with an expression of astonishment that the Protestant princes and estates could give tolerance to this error which has been condemned by the Church so often (toties), which Jerome, eleven hundred years ago, refuted so successfully against the heretic Vigilantius and which long afterwards was again revived by the Albigenses, the Poor Men of Lyons, the Picards, the Cathardi old and new. The article must be utterly rejected (paenitus rejiciendus est) and in har-

(72) Comp. for instance Trede, *Bilder aus dem religiösen und sittlichen Leben Sueditaliens* I, 31. Victor Schultze, *Der roemische Katholizismus*, 300 sq.

(73) Jacobs, p. 235. Mueller, p. 223.

(74) Kolde, *Analecta Lutherana*, 143. Spalatinius' *Annales*, 149. Corp. Ref. II, 253.

mony with the entire universal Church be condemned. For in favor of the invocation of saints we have not only the authority of the entire Church, but also the agreement of the holy fathers, Augustine, Bernard, Jerome, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Basil. Neither is the authority of Holy Scripture absent from this Catholic assertion. From the canonical books the following passages are quoted: The words of Jesus, John 12:26: "If any man will serve me, him will my Father honor." We shall interpose a few critical remarks as we go along, and here we say: Certainly will God honor his faithful servant in the eternal reward. Is not unmerited salvation great honor? But where do we hear read anything of those arbitrarily invented honors such as are the presumption of Catholic saint-worship? But how ridiculous now from this passage of Scripture to draw the following conclusion: "If, therefore, God honors saints, why do not we, insignificant men (*nos homunculi*), honor them?" That was exactly what the Augsburg Confession admonished us to do, to honor the memory of the saints. But how does this passage help to prove the invocation of saints and that we should call on them as our intercessors? Then they referred to Job 42:8: "And my servant Job shall pray for you: for him will I accept." But this is first of all said to be of living Job, and certainly the intercessory prayers of the righteous have the promise that they avail much. We may admit also that the saints continue to pray for us after their departure from this life. But we can concede this only by calling attention to some remarks of Melancthon in the Apology which at once show that we here tread on uncertain ground: "Although concerning the saints we concede that just as when alive they pray for the Church in general, so in heaven they pray for the Church *in general*, albeit no testimony concerning the dead praying is extant in the Scriptures, except the dream taken from the second book of Maccabees (15:14)." (75) What can not be proved by Scripture is this that the saints in *concrete cases* know our needs, can hear our petitions and bring special petitions before God. This is just

(75) Jacobs, 236. Mueller, 224. Compare also Melancthon's Concilium Gallis scriptum of Aug. 1st. 1534 in Corp. Ref. II, 757 and 768: "Certum est enim, sanctos in coelos orare pro toto ecclesia in commune; sicut et in hac vita homines pii orant pro universa ecclesia."

as little proved by two other passages which the authors of the "Confutation" quoted from the Revelation of St. John (chapter 5:8) who speaks of the four beasts and the twenty-four elders falling down before the Lamb, "having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints;" and (chapter 8:3) where there was given to the angel much incense "that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne," and then is added in the 4th verse: "And the smoke of the incense which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand." Also from these passages we can take nothing more than that the deceased saints pray for us in a general way, *in genere* as Melanchthon says.(76) After such poor arguments the writers of the Confutation close with the following abortive conclusions: "Christ, therefore, is our chief Advocate, and indeed the greatest; but since the saints are members of Christ (Cor. 12:27 and Eph. 5:30) and conform their will to that of Christ, and see that their head, Christ, prays for us, who can doubt that the saints do the very same thing which they see Christ doing?" This sounds pious, but these words are nothing but the veil over a condition in the Catholic Church that repels the religious feeling of every child of the Church of the Reformation.(77)

While Melanchthon was already preparing his Apology in which it was his intention to state the truth much more sharply than was done in the Augustana, the two contending parties decided to begin negotiations in order to see whether or not agreement could be reached. (Kirchliche Reunionsbestrebungen). The Augsburg Confession was made the basis of the discussions which now followed, and there was also a good deal deliberated upon our twenty-first article.(78) In an opinion (Gutachten)

(76) Concerning the apocryphal passage second book of Maccabees which the confutors also quoted compare our remarks in the first part of this treatise in connection with the statements of Origin.

(77) A print of the "Confutatio," Latin, is found in Kolde, Die Augsb. Conf. mit Bellagen, p. 151. Translated into English by Dr. Jacobs, Book of Concord II, 220 sq.

(78) We have a very vivid and reliable treatment of these Kirchliche Reunionsbestrebungen in Dr. J. W. Richard's "Luther and the Augsburg Confession," Part III, 82-105. A reprint from the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Oct. 1899, Jan., July and Oct. 1900.

Dr. Eck had made the following statements concerning the twenty-first article: This article, "of the worship of saints, differs from our teaching. Here are three things: The veneration of the saints, our invocation of the saints, the intercession of the saints for us. The Lutherans admit the veneration. They reject the other two. The intercession of the saints is admitted by the Sacramentarians. Here harmony is not probable, unless they confess with the Church, since a living person may call upon a living one, a mortal upon a mortal, a sinner upon a sinner, a beggar upon a beggar, why may he not call upon an immortal, a righteous one, one free from sin, rich in grace, in goodness, in compassion, and deeply interested in our welfare?"(79) In the discussions the Lutheran members of the Joint-Committee (Melancthon, Brenz, etc) though on the whole they were too yielding, wrested from the Catholic members at least the confession that the invocation of saints was not demanded by Scripture. In their final report they said on saint-worship: "In the twenty-first article we are agreed in two points, namely, that the saints and angels with God in heaven pray for us. Second, that we agree to observe as sacred and solemn the anniversaries and feasts of the saints when we pray God that the intercession of the saints be helpful to us. But as regards the invocation of saints, they are not yet agreed with us. They, indeed, express themselves that they do not forbid it, but because Scripture does not expressly contain it, they refuse to call upon the saints, first because Scripture does not demand it and second because they fear that it might give rise to many and dangerous abuses.(80) But soon Luther from Koburg sent his well known protest against the negotiations.(81) Of special interest are the considerations of the Lutherans in Nuremberg. They declare: "There is no Scripture to be found anywhere that teaches, or that allows us to infer that deceased saints or the angels in heaven pray to God for us. Also there is no mediator, intercessor, or high priest before

(79) Schirrmacher, Briefe und Akten zu der Geschichte des Reichstages zu Augsburg, p. 205.

(80) Chytraeus, Historia der Augsb. Konf. p. 144 (German). Schirrmacher p. 222 (Latin).

(81) Comp Koestlin-Kawerau, Martin Luther II, 232. Dr. Richard p. 107 sqq.

God, as all Scripture shows, except Christ alone. What use is there then, what advantage do we have, from conceding and yielding this article to the Papists, which they have tried to base on the Scriptures, but of which the Scriptures have not a trace? And every intelligent person knows well what abuses have followed gradually from this article." And again: "Intercessory prayer on the part of the living proves nothing in favor of intercession of dead saints for us. . . . And even if it was true that the saints pray for us, from this does not follow that we shall invoke them to intercede for us." (82) Remonstrances of such kind and also the observation that none of the Roman Catholic concessions were sincere soon brought the negotiations to a close, and Melancthon received the instruction of the Protestant Princes to procede with writing his Apology.

In the Apology our twenty-first article was treated with special thoroughness. There is no "*Leise treten*" any more. Melancthon characterizes the "stupidity" (83) of the adversaries because of their awkward and futile argumentation. With much emphasis he criticises the assertion of the Papists that "the saints are not only intercessors, but also propitiators." (84) To this he says: "This is in no way to be endured." And even if they make a distinction "between mediators of intercession and mediators of redemption, yet they plainly make out of the saints mediators of redemption." In order to prove that this is meant by the worshipping of saints he describes the significance of "a propitiator, that his merits have been presented as those which make satisfaction for others, which are bestowed by divine imputation to others, in order that through these, just as by their own merits they may be accounted righteous. . . . Thus the merits of Christ are bestowed upon us, in order that, when we believe in him, we may be accounted righteous by our confidence in Christ's merits, as though we would have merits of our own." So the adversaries demand of us to call upon the saints and at the same time "they apply the merits of the saints just as the

(82) Schirrmacher 272, 285. Also Chytraeus 285; Walch XVI, 1766; Latin Coelestin II, 81 b.

(83) Jacobs 235. In the Latin: "*isti asini*;" the German translation of Dr. Jonas: "*grobe Esel*." Muler 223.

(84) Jacobs 236.

merits of Christ to others, they bid us trust in the merits of the saints, as though we were accounted righteous by the merits of the saints, in like manner as we are accounted righteous by the merits of Christ."

This is no misrepresentation. For "in indulgence they say that they apply the merits of the saints." Here Melancthon makes use of a thought contained in the Torgau Articles when he writes: "Perhaps they derive this arrangement from the palaces of kings, where friends must be employed as intercessors. But if a king will appoint a certain intercessor, he will not desire that cases be brought to him through others." (85)

Already in the preceding Melancthon had quoted, as proof of his assertion that the saints are represented to be propitiators, an interpretation of the canon of the Mass given by Gabriel where he says: "According to the order instituted by God, we should betake ourselves to the aid of the saints, in order that we may be saved by their merits and vows." Now he gives two more illustrations: "Here and there this form of absolution is used: The passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the most blessed virgin Mary and of all the saints, be to thee for the remission of sins." And another case: "Some of us have seen a doctor of theology dying, for consoling whom a certain theologian, a monk, was employed. He pressed upon the dying man nothing but his prayer: 'Mother of grace, protect us from the enemy, receive us in the hour of death.'" This leads us to Mary of whom no mention had been made in the Augustana. But here the Apology does not refrain from making the following statements: "Granting that the blessed Mary prays for the Church, does she receive souls in death, does she conquer death, does she quicken? What was Christ to do, if the blessed Mary do these things? Although she is most worthy of the most ample honors, nevertheless she does not wish to be made equal to Christ, but rather wishes us to consider and follow her example. But the subject itself declares that in public opinion the blessed Virgin has succeeded altogether to the place of Christ. Men have invoked her, have trusted in her mercy, through her have

(85) The eleventh of the Torgau Articles, Comp. Kolde, Augsb. Konf. 139. Jacobs II, 85.

desired to appease Christ, as though he were not a Propitiator, but only a dreadful judge and avenger." (86)

Melanchthon also calls attention to the heathen origin of the invocation of saints: "To each saint a particular administration has been committed, that Anna bestowes riches, Sebastian keeps off pestilence, Valentine heals the epilepsy, George protects horsemen. These opinions have clearly sprung from heathen examples (Jacobs I, 240. Mueller 228.) Neither does the Apology neglect to emphasize that this service has been mainly for the purpose of "bringing in gain." And the following story is told: "In a certain monastery some of us have seen a statue of the blessed Virgin, which was moved by art (within by a string) as though it were an automaton, so as to seem either to refuse or to grant consent to those inquiring." (87)

In 1551 Melanchthon found occasion to repeat this protest of the Lutheran Church against saint-worship in the *Repetitio Confessionis Augustanae* which he prepared for the council at Trent. Here he begins the article with the passage, Isaiah 43:8: "My glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images," and he exclaims: "It is a pity that people will not understand such gross errors. Consider and think what thou doest when thou callest on St. Barbara. There thou forsakest God and forgettest to whom thou art praying. Thou knowest that such as St. Barbara, Anna and St. George can not see nor understand the sighs of the heart and if they knew that they were prayed to they would be terrified and they would protest against receiving honors which alone belong to God." (88) He emphasizes the futility of saint-worship and the feeling of uncertainty of which every one must be possessed that is praying to the saints. (89) Here the order of thoughts is different from the Augsburg Confession where for conciliatory purposes first was said that the Protestants also knew of veneration of saints; in this document Melanchthon first protests against the abuse and only at the close mentions how much the Church of the Reformation has retained

(86) Jacobs, I, 256-239. Mueller, 224-227.

(87) Jacobs I, 240. This incident is told with special vividness in the German text. Comp. Mueller, 229.

(88) Corp. Ref. XXVIII, 556.

(89) Corp. Ref. XXVIII, 557.

as scriptural.(90) In fact the Variata of 1540 already does not any longer retain the order of the first edition but similarly to the Repetitio treats first of true, Scriptural invocation of the Triune God, condemns secondly "the custom of invoking holy men who have departed from this life," and thirdly mentions in how far "it profiteth to recite the true histories of the godly."(91)

Speaking of how our article has been defended against Roman criticism we should before departing from this subject at least make mention of work which, it is true, does not belong to the Reformation period proper, but which has contributed much to the establishment of the doctrines of the Augustana and which also subjected the worshipping of saints in the Roman Catholic Church to a most searching criticism. I mean the Examen Concilii Tridentini of Martin Chemnitz, four volumes, which were the result of eight years of hard work on the part of the very learned author. Perhaps no work of that age (the last volume appeared 1573) has damaged the Roman Catholic Church more than this. In the last part of the third division, Chemnitz treats of the invocation of saints. We cannot here discuss the rich contents of this article but recommend it to everyone who wants to make a special study of the subject.(92)

We could now here close our lecture, for the passage that follows the testimony concerning the Invocation of Saints does strictly not belong to the twenty-first article, but forms the conclusion to the first part of the Augustana. Thus a discussion of this passage was not improperly desisted from by the lecturer of twenty-one years ago.(93) This closing part of the first division of the Augustana is so important for the proper estimation of the doctrinal articles of our confession as a whole that it ought to be treated apart from the invocation of saints in a special lecture which then could bring out the many suggestions

(90) Corp. Ref. XXVIII, 559 sq.

(91) English in Book of Concord, Jacobs II, 121 sq.; Latin, Kolde Augsb. Konf. mit Bellagen 187. Strange that Melancthon in the Variata of 1542 again returned to the order of the first editions. Comp. Jacobs II, 148. Kolde, 187.

(92) Chemnitz's Examen Concilii Tridentini, 4 vol., is written in Latin. It has been translated into German and condensed to a volume of 287 pages by R. Bendixen in connection with Luthardt, Leipzig 1884.

(93) Lectures on the Augsb. Conf. On the Holman Foundation. First Series. Luth. Publ. Soc'y. 1888.

contained in the remarkable statements. I shall not undertake a real discussion, but I cannot resist the temptation to offer in place of it, as a kind of a close to this discourse, a part of a letter received from Dr. Kawerau on the subject. (Dr. Kawerau was professor in Kiel when I had the privilege of attending his lectures. From Kiel he was called to the University of Breslau and is now Provost in Berlin and professor at that university). But that this letter may be understood, I shall first quote from the Augustana the sentences which have here always interested us most and have offered a perplexing problem to many who have tried to get at their real historical meaning.

Melanchthon writes: "This is about the sum of our doctrines from which it is evident that they contain nothing inconsistent with the Scriptures, or with either the Catholic or the Roman Church, so far as is known from the (ancient) writers (or fathers)." Latin: "*nihil inesse, quod discrepet a scripturis vel ob ecclesia catholica vel ab ecclesia romana, quatenus ex scriptoribus nobis nota est.*" (94) And again: "But the whole difference of opinion between us relates to certain abuses." Latin "*Tota dissensio est de paucis quibusdam abusibus.*" (95) The problem is: How could Melanchthon make such a statement, that concerning the subjects treated of in the doctrinal part of our Augustana (original sin, justification by faith, in connection with new obedience and faith and good works, doctrine of the Church, Lord's Supper, repentance) there was nothing inconsistent "with either the Catholic or the Roman Church?" How could the writer of the Loci who had followed the career of Luther in his protest against the Roman errors, and who soon, after the appearance of the Confutation, in his Apology treats so thoroughly of the fundamental differences between Lutheran and Scholastic theology make such statement, at such an occasion, as a summing up of the situation?

Let us now hear from Prof. Kawerau's letter: "Melanchthon wants to prove in the Augsburg Confession that the Lutherans

(94) "ex" and "nobis" are not found in our "textus receptus" in the Book of Concord, but this is the reading of all authoritative codices. Comp. Tschackert's critical text in "Die unveränderte Augsb. Konf." p. 115.

(95) Our "textus receptus" again does not have "tota," but it is found in all authoritative codices Comp. Tschackert *ibid.*

are members of the *Catholic Church*. They wanted to negotiate in Augsburg as a *faction* with an opposing *faction*, not as a *church* with another *church*. For this purpose Melanchthon had to prove that they were no heretics in the sense of the law of the empire. We must remember that since Emperor Theodosius the *heretics of the ancient Church* were threatened with civil penalties. The orthodox doctrine of the trinity and the oecumenical symbols were placed under imperial protection. Charles V. had declared at Augsburg that in the first place he would have to make sure whether the Lutherans were not teaching doctrines contrary to the "*twelve articles of faith*" (Apostle's Creed.) That's the reason why Melanchthon in the I. and III. articles emphasizes so strongly that in the doctrine of the Trinity they stand upon the Nicene Creed and confess all the articles of the Apostle's Creed. For this reason all the *old heresies* are so carefully rejected (I., II., VIII., XII., XVIII.) Melanchthon takes pains to prove that their doctrine is not the revival of any heresy rejected by the ancient Church, that, therefore, the Emperor has no cause to apply against them the laws concerning the heretics. He who acknowledges the decrees of the old councils, who rejects the old heresies, he stands upon the foundation of the *Catholic Church*! Now Melanchthon takes the position that since those ancient times through Scholasticism all kinds of perversions of doctrine, and all kinds of abuses in church practice have crept in to the Catholic Church. The Lutherans are so to say the *Old-Catholics* who have preserved the doctrine and ethics of the *ancient Church*, who have eliminated the erroneous conceptions that have crept in. When, now, Melanchthon at the close of article XXI refers to the *ecclesia romana*, quatenus ex scriptoribus nobis nota est, then that does not mean with him what we to-day call "*Roman*" Church, but it is that form of the Church which presents itself approximately in the writings of a Leo I. and Gregory I.—the Church of the first five centuries. From the church fathers of those centuries he takes his quotations. His leading thought is: Where we dissent from you, there *we* are Old-Catholics (Altgläubige) and *you* are those who have changed (Neugläubige). If one reads the article XXI entirely without suspicion, then one cannot understand how Melanchthon

could make such a concession: in our doctrine there is nothing quod discrepet ab ecclesia romana! But if closely scanned it is only the assertion *that they have the old church fathers on their side*. To be sure, in this Melanchthon is a dangerous diplomat, that he in such negotiations knows the art to mislead his opponents by smooth phrases. This art he has practiced in the Augustana with consummate skill. He often seems to concede much more than he really does! To-day we will, of course, say, it was an historical error when he said that the ancient Catholic Church was so completely on the side of the Lutherans. We know now that the Roman Catholic leaven was much older than he supposed. And here is the questionable point: Melanchthon concerning some points was keen-sighted enough to see that the agreement was not as extensive as he made it appear. But for tactical purposes he concealed it when he spoke publicly! (Otherwise in confidential correspondence). In interpreting the passage one must underscore heavily the seemingly innocent phrase "quatenus ex scriptoribus nobis nota est" and ask: of what scriptores does he here think? Then the difficulty which some feel disappears. But one will then also feel: the phrase is a swordsman's trick (Fechterstreich)!"

So Prof. Kawerau characterizes Melanchthon's assertion of substantial agreement between the Lutherans and the writers of "either the Catholic or the Roman Church," as an extravagant statement. And it must be admitted, the authors of the Confutation have proved it successfully, for instance in their reply to article XII "On Repentance," where they show that even as early as the Council of Nicea and the age of Ambrose and Leo the Great penances were demanded as part of repentance. We have seen that the invocation of saints flourished at the time of the three Capadocians. The lessons which we draw from these facts is this: Confessional subscription to the Augustana does not mean an obligation to accept remarks which were made in diplomacy to relieve the embarrassment of the hour. "Incidental allusions, quotations of authorities even the pertinency of arguments used, are subsidiary matters." (96) Such admission does

(96) Dr. Jacobs in "The Lutheran," March 5, 1908 (p. 403).

not in the least affect the confessional substance proper of the Augustana—the *doctrines* set forth which, clustering about the article of a standing and falling Church, (contained in article IV in connection with V, VI and especially XX), represent an organism that must be viewed in reference to the relation of each part to every other part and to the whole.

Atchison, Kansas.

ARTICLE II.

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTER TO THE SYNOD.*

WILLIAM SHINDEL SIGMUND.

"The most fundamental characteristic of living things," Professor John Fiske tells us, "is their response to external stimuli. If you come upon a dog lying by the roadside and are in doubt whether he is alive or dead, you poke him with a stick; if you get no response you presently conclude that it is a dead dog. So if the tree fails to put forth leaves in response to the rising vernal temperature, it is an indication of death." Men also have passed the dead line when they have become indifferent to the moral and intellectual spirit of their times; while those who respond promptly to this *zeitgeist* are, whatever their years, very much alive; and if this sensitiveness is joined with well-considered experience, they are probably the most influential men of their generation.

To be useful, however, one must be more than simply alive. He must not only respond to impressions made upon him, but he must respond properly; he must be in right relation to his times. It is possible to be alive, and, just because one is alive, prove a hindrance rather than a help to human welfare. One may be so ruled by his prejudices as to be wiser in his own conceit than seven men that can render a reason. Such contrariness may doubtless at times serve some useful end; but firmly set jaws and stiff necks are not usually regarded as the hallmarks of largest usefulness: it is the oxygen of the atmosphere rather than the nitrogen, which we think of as necessary to life.

This latter truth—that to be useful one must be in right relation to the spirit and movements of his times, and, inferentially, that he is the most useful who is nearest in perfect harmony with these—indicates the importance of the subject now proposed for our consideration. The organized work of the church

* An address delivered to the Faculty and students of Hamma Divinity School of Wittenberg College.

is an expression of the spirit of the times—this is true even when that spirit is itself an effect of the teaching and work of the Church—and the relation of the minister to the organized work of the Church is fundamental to all his other relationships. If this relation is wrongly regarded or not properly maintained, the minister's usefulness will unquestionably be much hindered, and may possibly be prevented altogether.

In studying this subject, the chief point to be considered is the relation of the minister to the synod, since the synod is the governmental unit in our form of Church polity; and our discussion has especial reference, of course, to this relation as it exists in the General Synod. We may study this relation advantageously from three points of view: that of the minister's rights, that of his privileges, and that of his duties.

I.

The relation of the minister to the synod in respect to his ministerial rights, may be briefly stated as follows: that, as far as human instrumentality is concerned, the minister derives all his ministerial rights from the Church through the synod; and that he can retain and exercise those rights only while he remains a member of the synod, and upon conditions which the synod itself imposes.

The first of these propositions implies that more than human instrumentality is required really to invest a person with ministerial rights—which is true. It also declares that the only human instrumentality which is employed in conferring them is the Church, acting through the synod. The truth of this also may easily be seen.

The Protestant Church has from its beginning insisted upon the priesthood of all believers, upon their perfect equality in Christ Jesus, and their common commission to proclaim the gospel. It has uniformly taught that all Christians may come immediately to God without any mediator except Christ, may offer God their prayers, and, further, may dedicate themselves to Him in holy obedience and spiritual service—in which things the essence of all priesthood lies. At the same time, the Protestant Church believes in the intrinsic necessity, to use Bishop

Martensen's phrase, of a clerical office and a clerical class; she recognizes the need for a special ministerial class, both because it is necessary for the sake of maintaining church order, and also because, since our Savior expressly commanded the preaching of the gospel, it is plainly His intention that there should ever be a body of men to whom this preaching, together with the administration of the sacraments and the pastoral care of His people, should be entrusted.

As to who should be considered authorized teachers of the Word, the Lutheran Church's official declaration is: "Concerning church orders they teach, that no person ought publicly to teach in the church, or to administer the sacraments, without a regular call." This regular call is two-fold: one part of it is the selection and appointment, by the Great Head of the Church, of the men to be His messengers, whom also He disposes to be willing to assume the work of this ministry; the other part is the formal and official ratification by the church that such call has been given by the Lord. This ratification is always preceded by an inquiry into the reasons why any person believes himself chosen and prepared for the pastoral office; and the duty of such investigation and consequent decision is delegated by the Church to her representatives in the synod. These brethren, seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit, that they may perceive and admit what merely human knowledge cannot discern, speak authoritatively for the Church. A favorable action on their part, it is true, cannot constitute any one a true messenger of the gospel unless he has been called as such by the Lord Himself, but an unfavorable action will effectually prevent anyone's reception as an accredited teacher of God's Word. The favorable action of the synod is necessary, and it is the only work of man that is necessary, to acknowledge and confer upon any one ministerial rights.

The facts just mentioned hold good, even when, as is customary, the whole matter of examination of candidates for the ministry and of action relating thereto, is entrusted to the Ministerium. The Ministerium is then simply a large committee, to whom, under the constitution of the synod, certain specific duties have been assigned. It is not representative of the Church except as such a committee of the synod, for the Church must be

represented by laymen as well as by ministers. As such a committee, its findings ought always to be reported back to the synod for ratification, as is sometimes done, but, whether so reported and ratified or not, the actions of the Ministerium have validity only because the synod gives its approval, formally or tacitly, to all its proceedings.

The second proposition is that a minister, when he has thus been accorded ministerial rights by the synod, can retain and exercise those rights only while he remains a member of the synod. He cannot, because of dissatisfaction or any other reason, withdraw from the synod and yet retain the prerogatives the synod has conferred upon him.

This question has not arisen in our Church in recent years, probably because of the facility with which dissatisfied brethren can vault the ecclesiastical fences, and the eagerness with which some of our sister denominations at times welcome to their ministrymen who have become entirely discredited with us, and sometimes even those who, because of immorality, have been thrust out of the sacred office.

Another reason why it does not arise may be because it was thoroughly discussed and emphatically settled half a century ago. At that time a member of the Maryland Synod, who, "after cool and calm reflection," felt "compelled to this by feelings of self-respect," asked the President of that body for a letter of honorable dismissal, "without intending to apply to any other synod or to any other ecclesiastical body for admission." The President attempted to persuade him to withdraw his application, but when he insisted that the letter be given, it was granted. At the next convention of the synod, however, the Ministerium refused to ratify the action of the President in giving this certificate, on the ground that "an honorable dismissal cannot constitutionally be given by its presiding officer to a member who remains within the bounds of the synod;" and, with some dissenting, they requested the brother to return the letter which had unconstitutionally been given him. As the brother departed this life before the following convention of the synod, it can never be known what action would have been taken had he ignored the synod's request; but the principle involved—whether a man in good standing in a synod, and wishing to discontinue

his membership therein, though announcing no intention to join any other synod, is entitled to an honorable dismissal, it being understood that he might continue performing ministerial duties—became the subject of warm discussion for some months in the Church periodicals. Those who defended such a dismissal did so upon the ground that it was God who made ministers, qualified and ordained them; and that the synod did not constitute ministerial character, but merely recognized and proclaimed it. If the synod, after proper examination, was convinced that God had called and qualified a man for the ministerial office, and acknowledged him as a minister of Jesus Christ, what right had it, they asked, to forbid him to withdraw from a body into which he had voluntarily entered? This specious argument did not prevail with the brethren who took a more practical view of the question; and the conclusion of the whole matter was, that the synod, a short while afterwards, placed the following decision on record: that while synodical organizations were not of divine origin, yet the value of such fraternal association had been abundantly demonstrated as wise and necessary; and that since the synod had been adopted by our Church in this country as its form of government, it was rightfully expected that all who claimed to be accredited ministers thereof should seek connection with one of our district synods; that, furthermore, while any minister in good standing might at any time withdraw from the synod and receive testimonials of his good standing up to the time of his withdrawal, such testimonials must be granted by the synod itself in convention assembled, and not by the President between the conventions of the synod; and that the brother receiving them would not, until he had again obtained synodical membership, be recognized as a minister of the Lutheran Church.

That the foregoing position is endorsed by the General Synod is shown by the language of the "Minister's Synodical Dismissal," which it authorizes. These dismissals distinctly state that the membership of a minister in the synod which dismisses him ceases only when he has been regularly received by the synod to which he has been dismissed. It is clearly the intention of the General Synod that none of her ministers shall ever be without synodical membership.

The advantages of this requirement by our Church, that all her ministers must be members of some synod, appear when its effects are contrasted with the effects of the form of church polity known as independency.

This form is without doubt the loosest and most easy-going of all forms of church government. Any individual congregation, inasmuch as it is a complete church in itself, subject to no superior authority but that of Jesus Christ, can elect anybody as its pastor, and thus induct him into the ministry. This is a proceeding which is frequently conducted with less care than the selection of a janitor, and it is not at all worthy of any recognition as ordination. By being thus elected as a pastor of a church, the fortunate candidate obtains inalienable ministerial rights, whether he continue in the pastorate or not; and his agility in changing back and forth between the ministry and some secular calling might well put a professional acrobat to shame. Furthermore, he is responsible to nobody and nobody is responsible for him. He cannot be called to account for any misconduct whatsoever; no one can really depose him from the ministry. Even if the church, of which he is pastor, should ask him to resign and starve him out—a not unusual occurrence—this does not revoke the ministerial power their previous election conferred upon him. He goes to and fro in the earth and walks up and down in it, as Elder So-and-so to the end of the chapter. His having been once pastor of a church has stamped upon him a more indelible character than the Roman Catholic sacrament of ordination.

One cannot wonder that, with such a speedy and uncomplicated method of putting men into the pastoral office, the ministry of those churches should abound with ministerial adventurers; nor that the people, accustomed to have their shepherds manufactured in such careless style, should entertain scant respect for them. The difference between the honor generally accorded to their pastors by such congregations as believe them to be Christ's gifts to them for possibly their lifetime, and the lack of esteem displayed by these other congregations to men whose contact with their lives is as unimportant as that of ships that pass in the night, is so great that one must be acquainted with it at first hand really to believe it. While there are many upright, self-

sacrificing, devout servants of the Lord among these men, who are revered because of their godly life and character, it is simply the truth that the mere fact that one is a minister, made so in the manner above described, inspires in the community no respect for him whatever. What extra consideration he gets is as likely as anything else to be more careful investigation of the truth of his statements, or more vigilant surveillance of his behaviour toward the ewes of his flock, and more insistence upon promptness in settling his accounts. This is just what might be looked for when anybody, just because he is pleasant to the eye, and hath a lovely voice and a glib tongue, may, without examination or formality, be thrust into the high office of a messenger of the Most High, and then turned loose upon a world which had already a surfeit of calamities.

That our synodical membership has great advantage over such independency at every point is perfectly plain. A minister, who is known to be in good standing in his synod, is, because of that fact alone, presumed to be entitled to respect and honor: for such membership is a guarantee that those who are best acquainted with him confide in his personal worth and integrity. If he should misbehave himself as a minister, every one knows that he will be brought sharply to time by his fellow ministers. The church of which he is shepherd cannot in any way white-wash him and prevent such an investigation. At the same time no congregation, however unpleasant it may make it for their pastor, can without cause dismiss him, with impunity, from the pastorate, nor can they, in any way, deprive him of any of his ministerial rights. His synodical membership is, among other things, a protection from the persecution and hate which have caused many a faithful pastor since St. Paul to ask his brethren to pray that he might be delivered from unreasonable and evil men.

The third proposition respecting the rights of a minister, as affected by his relation to the synod, is, that he can receive, retain and exercise these rights upon such conditions only as the synod itself imposes. This proposition needs no long discussion, since it claims for the synod nothing more than all voluntary organizations claim. Every member of the synod became such upon terms the synod laid down, and it is the unquestionable

right of the majority to fix the rules under which such membership may continue to be enjoyed. That a synod has united with the General Synod, and is bound to abide by its constitution, does not contradict this proposition, for the adoption of the constitution of the General Synod was the free act of the synod, whereby it limited itself in certain matters: and if, at any time, it finds such a limitation inadvisable, it can easily sever its connection with the higher body. Furthermore, as is evident, it is not necessary that the conditions of synodical membership should be identical among all the synods. Just as the different States composing our nation all uphold the national constitution, and yet may differ in the qualifications they prescribe for electors, so may the synods do. None may require less than the constitution of the General Synod requires, but any one may require more, provided the additional requirements do not conflict with the constitution of the General Synod, and what additional requirements shall be made must be left to the judgment of the synod itself. Neither can the General Synod dictate to any synod what conditions shall or shall not be insisted upon. It may offer advice, as, for example, at the convention of 1905, it recommended that "when it appears that a clergyman has left the active ministry and gone into a secular business of choice or preference, and not of necessity, he shall be required to return his ordination papers," but its recommendations in such cases are purely advisory. In matters pertaining exclusively to the affairs of any synod—please note this qualification carefully—the synod itself is, and must be, the final authority for what shall be done.

II.

The second point of view, from which the relation of the minister to the synod may be considered, is in respect to his privileges. These, as might be supposed, are many and of great value.

First among them, is the consciousness that one has been authoritatively commissioned as a preacher of the Word of God. The rite of ordination bears the same relation to a minister's belief that he is called to the pastoral office, that the sacrament of

baptism does to his belief that God, for Christ's sake, has forgiven him his sins. In the latter case, while the promise of the gospel had often been heard, as it was extended generally to men, and the hearer had believed that he was included among those to whom pardon was freely offered, yet in his baptism he is individually assured that God has freely forgiven his own personal sins and received him personally into His favor: for baptism is not the work of man, but of God, and the Church baptises in God's stead and at His command. In precisely the same way, one's ordination is an official ratification that his belief that he has been called of God to preach His Word is true, since the synod, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, after proper efforts have been made to know God's will, has solemnly set him apart and entrusted to him the work of the gospel ministry. The fundamental fact of every minister's consciousness, therefore, ought to be, that God, through the Church, has deliberately chosen him for this work and conferred upon him these ministerial rights.

This consciousness will prove an inestimable blessing to every thoughtful minister. For one thing, when great trials and difficulties face the worker, when seemingly there is no progress, nothing but delay and probable failure as the result of one's work, and one is consequently prone to be cast down and out of heart, the knowledge that he has not assumed responsibilities unnecessarily, or undertaken needless tasks, but that he is where he is because of divine appointment, enables him to continue perseveringly at his duty. Isaiah was not the last person, by any means, sent with God's message to a people spiritually blind, deaf and stupid, and almost wholly unconcerned about their relations to their Maker. There is much labor, both at home and in foreign fields, which appears no more promising than

“the toil

Of dropping buckets into empty wells,
And growing old in drawing nothing up!”

Only an assured conviction that God has set him at his task can, under such circumstances, keep the workman faithfully at it—but that can!

Another great help from this consciousness that one has been

divinely chosen for his work, is the assurance that God expects him to do the work satisfactorily. God believed he could do it, and would do it, when He set him at it. This was St. Paul's great encouragement: "I thank Him that enableth me, even Christ Jesus our Lord, for that He counted me faithful, appointing me to His service: tho I was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious." The fact that God trusted him, and expected him to be faithful, in spite of his former bitter hatred and frenzied persecution of His Church, was probably, throughout his entire Christian life, the most central fact in St. Paul's mind. Time after time, under widely different circumstances, he dwells upon it—always speaking of it most humbly and gratefully—as the crowning proof of God's amazing mercy, that He not only forgave him his sins, but commissioned him to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ. Now, towards the close of that life, he gives us, in this passage, a glimpse at what had sustained him in his arduous toil—it was his knowledge of God's faith in his fidelity.

A second privilege of synodical membership is the opportunity of assisting in directing the work of the Church, and of having the benefit of the collective judgment of a number of Christian brethren.

The honor and help of this privilege, just because it is enjoyed regularly and as a matter of course, may sometimes not be properly appreciated. Even the holiest duties, such as the administration of baptism or of the Lord's Supper, are sometimes, because of frequent repetition, performed without an appropriate sense of their sanctity. They are often done mechanically, or as a matter of duty, and the profound awe and reverence with which they were first performed, have to a large extent passed away. This is probably an inevitable result of familiarity with sacred things, unless unusual care is taken to keep alive a sense of their sacredness: and it need not cause surprise if the privilege just mentioned is often enjoyed with hardly a thought of its greatness. Yet we need consider it but for a moment to perceive that high honor has been shown us. God has committed unto us the word of reconciliation: we are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: and the whole planning and management of this work is entrusted

unreservedly to us! Can you imagine with what joy and delight an angel would grasp at this privilege—to have an opportunity to give his counsel in forming plans to extend the kingdom of his Lord?

Closely related to this privilege of assisting in directing the work of the Church, is the privilege of being assisted in one's own work by the advice of our fellow ministers. The benefit of such assistance by one's associates is universally recognized: it is the reason for multitudes of conferences, institutes and other meetings, at which matters of every conceivable sort are examined and reported on and discussed. Yet the advantage of such friendly consultation about our religious work does not rest alone upon the belief that in a multitude of counsellors there is safety. It rests upon the promise of our Lord to be in the midst of two or three, gathered together in His name, and to guide them in their deliberations. That promise surely means that when a number of Christian workers unitedly and earnestly seek to know the will of God touching their work, and are resolved unselfishly to do whatever God may indicate, God, through their resultant judgment, will guide them as they ought to go. It is plain that the Apostles and the early Church so understood it; and the decision of a number of the Apostles was much more readily acquiesced in than the opinion of a single individual.

This probably accounts for a difference sometimes to be discerned in the tone in which these opinions were given. When St. Paul was asked for his advice on certain matters, regarding which he had received no definite instructions from the Lord, notice with what modesty he gives it: "I have no commandment from the Lord, but I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful." "She is happier if she abide as she is, after my judgment, and I think that I also have the Spirit of God." The seeming hesitation with which he utters these words, does not arise from any misgiving whether he is divinely guided in his decision, but from his knowledge that his views might be, as they often were, challenged and contradicted by his enemies. Note the contrast to be seen in the announcement of the finding of the Council at Jerusalem: "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no

greater burden than these necessary things." The apostles and elders had been gathered together to consider this matter; there had been much questioning among them, and we may be sure the debate had been spirited; they finally, having come to one accord, decided that the Gentile Christians should be required to abstain from only four things—"the Gentile customs," as Professor Purves tells us, "which were most abhorrent in Jewish eyes." In the face of enormous prejudice, they were loyal to the manifest will of God, and there is a positive and decisive authority in the tone of their decree, which shows plainly that they expected the churches to regard it as final; as, indeed, they did. St. Luke tells us, that the Church at Antioch, when they had read the epistle, rejoiced for the consolation: whatever doubt had before disturbed them was now removed: this troublesome matter had been laid before their brethren in the Lord, and in their decision they were sure they had an expression of God's will. In precisely the same way, when we lay our perplexities before our synodical brethren for counsel, may we be confident that the Master will direct them and us as we seek unselfishly to know His will.

One other privilege which we enjoy because of our synodical membership, is the benefit of the sympathy, and especially the prayers, of our brethren.

The source of courage and confidence to a soldier in battle is not mainly his personal skill and might, but the consciousness that he is one of a great host engaged in one attempt, animated by one spirit, and possessing collectively infinitely more resources than himself. This consciousness nerves him to desperate assaults or to long continued resistance, neither of which he would contemplate for a moment if he contended alone; his knowledge of the sympathy and support of his comrades sustains him as nothing else could possibly do. It is not otherwise with the minister of the gospel. Bound by synodical relations to his fellow ministers, he knows himself as a part of a great world-movement for the expansion and establishment of the kingdom of God. If matters progress slowly with him, they may be moving more rapidly at some other point of the line, and the success of one is ultimately the success of all. If it be his lot to encounter unusual difficulties or disheartening opposition, the as-

surance that his brethren sympathize with him, pray for him and are ready to help him as occasion serves, aids him wonderfully.

A great deal might be said about this, yet, after all, while the worth of this fellow-feeling may be insisted upon and illustrated, it is only through experience that any one can really know it. It is only when,

"With aching hands and bleeding feet,
We dig and heap, lay stone on stone;
We bear the burden and the heat
Of the long day and wish 'twere done,"

that we can really understand the hitherto unimagined power of our brother's sympathy to cheer and strengthen.

It may, perhaps, be doubted also whether any of us appreciates adequately the worth of our brother's prayers in our behalf; yet nothing is more evident than that, in New Testament times, such prayer was constantly solicited. Jesus recognized in it a means for meeting a great emergency, when He told His disciples to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into His harvest. Paul repeatedly asks his fellow Christians to pray for him, and expected help through their prayers. The early Christians, indeed, as if by instinct, thus besought God for their brethren in peril.

The most conspicuous instance of such prayer is probably when Peter was in danger of death. Like a bolt from a clear sky, the persecution of Herod the king had fallen upon the Church. For a considerable time the Christians had enjoyed peace and quiet growth, and no doubt believed this might be the settled order of things. Probably no particular danger was anticipated when Herod received Judea as part of his kingdom, though his evident friendliness to the Jews and endeavor to win their favor, might well have aroused suspicion. But just before the great Passover week, when thousands of visitors were in the city, and the very atmosphere seemed charged with religious fervor, the attack began. For some reason unknown to us, James, the brother of John, was the first victim, and thus one of the fiery "sons of thunder" laid down his life for his Lord. Congratulations immediately poured into this palace. More than

he had dared to hope, Herod had secured an instant and enthusiastic popularity. Demonstrations of approval could not have been more gratifying. Naturally his next endeavor was to increase this favor of the people, wherefore he proceeded to seize the great apostolic leader himself. We cannot realize what days of anxiety and terror that feast must have been to the Christians. Herod made no secret of his intention, after the sacred season was past, to make a public spectacle of Peter's execution. The approaching anniversary of the crucifixion of their Lord filled the minds of the disciples with forebodings of impending disaster; many believed that the prediction respecting Peter was now to be fulfilled, that he should stretch forth his hands and another should gird him and carry him whither he would not. The fate of Stephen, probably the most brilliant and gifted man the Church at Jerusalem ever knew, would remind them that the seeming indispensability of their leader was no assurance that his life would be spared. Herod, as though to mock any effort on their part to rescue him, had set four times the usual guards about his prisoner, and wherever the Christians went, their enemies gloated over them with looks of vindictive and triumphant hate. Up to the very night before Peter was to have been brought forth to die, there was not the slightest indication of deliverance. In such a time of dire extremity, we know very well that only the most effective means would be resorted to for help: "*prayer* was made earnestly of the Church unto God for him." Unceasingly they

"sent prayer like incense up
To God the strong, God the beneficent,
God ever mindful in all strife and strait,
Who, for our own good, makes the need extreme,
Till at the last He puts forth might and saves."

III.

The third point of view from which the relation of the minister to the synod may be considered is from that of his duties.

Bearing in mind that the synod was formed for the purpose of consultation and mutual encouragement, and for the promo-

tion of the welfare of the churches connected therewith, and that the chief purpose of the annual meeting is to adopt measures that may most advance the interests of the kingdom of God, the minister's duties may appropriately be grouped in two classes—those which relate to planning the work of the synod, and those which relate to executing these plans.

One of the most necessary duties of the first group, is for a minister to acquaint himself thoroughly with the rules and customs which govern the synod in the transaction of its business. At first mention, this duty may seem commonplace and perhaps trivial; yet, apart from the fact that nothing which contributes to the progress of the kingdom of God dare be considered insignificant, such knowledge is plainly necessary if one would assist intelligently in planning the synod's work; and one's usefulness and influence may depend largely upon his knowing and conforming to the established way of doing things.

To this end, a new member of a synod should study at once its constitution and by-laws, the parliamentary manual chosen as authoritative, its special rules of order, its order of business, and, as far as possible, its unwritten customs, such as exist to some extent in every organization. All of these except the last may be learned without attending the conventions of synod; the peculiar customs of the synod can be learned, of course, chiefly by observation when the synod is actually in session, since these probably vary considerably in the different synods. In our synod, for example, the reports of officials, delegates, directors, and committees, whether standing or special, are presented in such order that definite and final action may be taken on them without delay—only a few recommendations, and these because they affect more than the matter immediately in hand, being referred to some committee, which will present its report at a later time. Accordingly, all discussion of a matter is desired, if at all possible, when the subject is first presented to the synod: such a report as that of the Committee on Apportionment or on Resolutions is not expected to occasion remarks on the general work of the Church which has been dealt with in former reports. When customs such as these are known and followed, the business of the synod glides along placidly and quickly, but great confusion and delay and waste of time may frequently result

through failure to work harmoniously with such established usages.

At the same time, important as rules of order are, it is an inexcusable blunder to suppose that their strict observance is the chief end to be sought. Few greater nuisances exist than those extra precise people who precipitate a vast amount of unseemly wrangling in order to maintain an unimportant point of order. Parliamentary rules were made for organizations, and not organizations for parliamentary rules. They are but forms through which a spirit of expeditious orderliness may work, and if this spirit be wanting, the rules are worthless—perhaps worse than worthless. "A spine and ribs are very necessary things," Bishop Potter reminds us, "but we bury them as so much chalk and lime when once the breath has gone out of them!"

A second duty resting upon ministers in planning the work of the synod, is to attend faithfully every session, without exception, of the synodical convention. He should bear in mind that none are unimportant, and that the most important of all are the devotional services.

The last day our class was in this Divinity School, one of our instructors, speaking of the work we were then about to enter, told us that, when once we became well acquainted with our people, we would be greatly surprised at the low standard of Christian life with which the average Christian was satisfied; that, since we had been reared in Christian homes, and for many years the highest ideals of Christian life and service had been held up before us for our imitation, it would be difficult at first for us to understand how such low ideals could be accepted as satisfactory. Doubtless all of us have found his prediction fulfilled: and if he had also told us that we would be surprised at the indifference of many of our ministerial brethren to the devotional services of the synod—that, since we had been for years associated here with fellow students in a prayerful and spiritual atmosphere, and accustomed through such fellowship in our devotional meetings to find help and inspiration, we would be greatly astonished at the evident unconcern with which these meetings were viewed by many pastors—the facts would have proved this true. The average attendance at the daily devotional services both of the General Synod and of the synods, does not equal one-third of the

attendance at the business sessions. Committee work, social conversation or sight-seeing are commonly allowed to reduce the number of those who meet to seek the guidance and blessing of God upon the deliberations of the day. My brethren, these things ought not so to be. We are undershepherds of God's flock; and our Chief Shepherd has left us an example, that we should follow the steps of

"those blessed feet
Which fourteen hundred years ago were nailed
For our advantage on the bitter cross."

Nothing is more evident in the records of His life, than the supreme place He accorded to prayer: and as we hope to be approved workmen, we dare not disparage what He esteemed of such transcendent worth.

We all know and admit this: and, as a matter of fact, the attendance at these devotional meetings is not a true indication of the real belief of the brethren about the value of prayer, as their conduct in any plainly seen crisis will show. At the convention of the General Synod in Des Moines, in 1901, the future of our mission work in Africa was trembling in the balance. Conditions about the mission had changed so completely since the work had been begun, so many precious lives had already, seemingly in vain, been laid down there for the Master, and the apparent results of the work were so pitifully small in comparison to the magnitude of toil and sacrifice and sorrow, that there was a conviction on the part of many that the continued outlay of blood and tears was not justifiable. On the other hand, many felt that these very martyrdoms had made the mission holy ground, which must not be abandoned, nor surrendered to some other denomination. It was a most difficult problem. On one point, however, the whole convention was agreed—that earnest prayer must be made to God for guidance: that action must not be taken hastily. Accordingly, even though the matter had already been debated for a long time, a resolution touching the work was laid on the table over night, that each delegate might seek instruction from the Lord.

This action, just mentioned, shows that when a weighty matter,

difficult of settlement, squarely confronts us, all are of one mind as to the need and worth of prayer. Since this is true, an all-sufficient reason for urging faithful attendance upon the devotional services of synod is, that we never know when matters of the gravest importance must be settled. Even these weighty problems are often unrecognized until the time to prepare aright to meet them has passed by. How dismayed and chagrined the nine disciples must have been to find themselves unable to cast out the demon from the epileptic boy at the foot of the Mount of Transfiguration—an act they all had often performed before. And with what shame and humiliation they heard their Master say that their failure was due to a lack of prayer! "The danger is," as Professor Bosworth tells us, "that some great opportunity will come to us on a prayerless day. If we had begun the day with prayer we should have been in a frame of mind to notice and use the opportunity. A little more of the preparation which we mean usually to make would have sufficed, but the opportunity came when, for lack of preparation, we were not quite equal to the occasion."

Of the duties whereby the minister may assist in doing the work which has been planned, obviously the first is to comply cheerfully with the decisions of the synod regarding such work. The relations existing between a synod and the congregations and pastors belonging thereto, and between the synods and the General Synod, are set forth in the constitutions of these bodies: and a prompt compliance with their decisions, when constitutionally made, is certainly an indisputable duty.

The synods and the General Synod are bodies representative of the Church, organized for mutual consultation, encouragement and help, and they have had delegated to them certain powers and duties. These powers and duties are very clearly defined. The General Synod is to "have control of all those interests of the Church which are of a general character;" it is to ascertain and publish facts relating to the existing state of the Church, with such recommendations as appear proper for the promotion of the kingdom of Christ at home and abroad; to provide books to be used in the public worship of the Church and in the catechetical instruction of the young; to make provision for the general missionary, educational and charitable operations of the

Church, over which it has full oversight and administrative powers. In respect to precautions to prevent unpleasant and unfriendly collisions that might arise among the several synods, and in cases of complaint regarding doctrine or discipline, the power of the General Synod is limited to giving advice or opinion, but in all the other matters mentioned above, it has full and complete authority. The synods likewise have complete supervision of the general work of their own churches, such as forming or changing ministerial districts, providing supplies for destitute churches, enforcing the observance of the Formula of Government, and devising and executing all suitable measures for the promotion of piety and the general prosperity of the Church.

The point to be observed, then, if a minister desires to assist in accomplishing the plans of the synod, is that, in regard to these matters concerning the general work of the Church, the action of the synod or of the General Synod is final and mandatory. No synod has any right to set aside the decisions of the General Synod pertaining to matters committed to it by its constitution as though that action were merely advisory and each synod might decide for itself what degree of conformity thereto was advantageous or desirable. Neither has any congregation or pastor any right to nullify the action of a synod by flatly refusing compliance with its decisions. In both cases there is a moral obligation to render obedience to decisions which have been made by lawful representatives.

This recalcitrance toward synodical recommendations manifests itself chiefly in matters of benevolence, and its unloveliness is plain when we notice the unworthy motive inspiring most of it. By far the largest part of it arises from selfishness—which is always unlovely. The synods which refuse to undertake to raise the full apportionment for all the objects designated by the General Synod, and the pastors who refuse to try to raise the full synodical apportionment, generally refuse because they believe too large a sum for benevolence is being asked, and that if so much is given to benevolence, the local expenses may not be met. A sufficient answer to this question is given above: one of the privileges of synodical membership is the benefit of the collective judgment of Christian brethren, who earnestly desire to know the Lord's will—which collective judgment is much more

likely than one's individual opinion to apprehend the real condition and needs of the Church. Furthermore, the experience of the congregations which attempt to comply with these synodical recommendations, proves their wisdom. Nevertheless, both synods and pastors sometimes refuse to abide by these decisions. Some of the amounts apportioned by the General Synod are reduced or rejected; and even such inconsistency is not wholly unknown, as to oppose in the synod the adoption of an apportionment for which the objector voted in the General Synod. It is also by no means rare that a pastor will utterly ignore a synodical decision, simply because it does not meet the approval of his own individual judgment.

Such conduct as this is most blameworthy. We can note its practical effect in political affairs in the plight of the Continental Congress, which could recommend measures to the several States, but was powerless to compel action in accordance therewith, even when national honor was at stake in the fulfillment of treaty obligations. We know also what the effect of such insubordination would be in military affairs, and that it would not be tolerated for a moment—an officer who would refuse, or even unnecessarily delay, to execute the decisions of a council of war, would be promptly courtmartialed and shot. Every minister, therefore, should mark the reprehensibleness of this conduct from every point of view, and for the sake of the prosperity of the Church as well as because of the moral obligation resting upon him, adopt the decisions of the synod and the General Synod as his program, and loyally strive to carry them into effect.

The last duty to be considered, and the most important of all, is to work in harmony with the religious spirit and tendencies of the Church. What was said above—that one's usefulness is dependent upon his being in right relation to the spirit of his times—applies as much to the religious as to any other tendencies: and it is wisdom of the highest sort to adjust ourselves aright to this prevailing spirit.

It is not at all difficult to know what the religious tendency in our General Synod is, and has been for a score of years. These years have seen the growth of an enthusiastic denominational loyalty, and a decided change in the attitude of our Church toward the theological work and attainments of our fathers.

The present tendency manifests itself, in part, in an earnest study of the history and teachings of our Church, and in an increasing appreciation of the unsurpassed—we might perhaps claim, unequalled—riches of our doctrinal inheritance. While nearly every other denomination has been regarding its confessions as less binding, and explaining or revising them to bring them down to date, the Lutheran Church has been clinging more closely to hers, cordially asserting her confidence in them as a correct and adequate expression of the fundamental truths of God's Word. The shortsighted and discreditable foolishness, which formerly in some quarters virtually apologized for these confessions, and sought to minimize the doctrinal differences between our Church and her ecclesiastical neighbors, has wellnigh disappeared; and in its place there is a self-respecting, robust Lutheran consciousness, aware of the worth of those things for which our Church distinctively stands, and demanding an acknowledgement of that worth from others.

A second matter in which the present religious tendency reveals itself, is in the use of forms of worship appropriate to the spirit and substance of our Church's teaching. While we believe, as our Confession declares, that for the true unity of the Church "it is not necessary that the same human traditions, that is, rites and ceremonies instituted by men should be everywhere observed," at the same time certain ways of worshipping God commend themselves to a cultivated judgment, as in accordance with the dignity and propriety which ought to characterize the approach of men into the presence of Deity, and certain other ways do not. It is therefore wholly a gain that recent years have seen the "restoration of the Services belonging to the youth and formative period of our Evangelical Church." There was a time, when, in certain places, by diligent search, pastors and congregations could be found, who bore the name of Lutheran, but, chameleon-like, took their hues from their surroundings. Their modes of worship, their administration of the sacraments, and even their light regard for the Scriptures, were all patterned after others. They became all things to all men that they might by all means win the favor of some. It is gratifying to know that this obsequious spirit of imitation is vanishing away, and

that the same esteem which exists for the Church's doctrines, exists also for her ways of worship.

A third characteristic of the religious tendency of the General Synod is a growing sense of the solidarity of the different branches of the Lutheran Church in this country. It has taken a long time for the various bodies of Lutherans to recognize that they have really a community of interests, and some appear not to know it even yet. They have exhibited toward each other for many years a spirit of mutual bitterness and suspicion, some of the divisions of our Lutheran hosts refusing to have fellowship with any other Christians whoever, and our own General Synod seeming sometimes to prefer fellowship with almost any other Christians than those acknowledging the same historic faith. It is humiliating to recall this unseemly strife between brethren; yet it is some consolation to know that we have not been sinners above all others. Professor Thompson tells us of the Covenanter Presbyterian Churches, at whose semi-annual communion services a missionary sermon was preached, in which the whole religious world was passed in review: "those that were afar off—atheists, pagans, Moslems, and the like—were treated with comparative leniency. It was as the preacher worked his way home that his blows gained in vigor; and, by the time he reached the Associate and Associate Reformed Presbyterians, the feathers flew! It is human nature to be on peaceable terms with one who differs from me by the width of the sky; but woe to the man who quarrels with me as to the right end at which to break an egg!"

It is a blessed thing for the kingdom of God that this spirit of alienation and mutual distrust is diminishing; that, just as, on the one hand, our General Synod, by participating in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, acknowledges that members of any evangelical church may be worthy of recognition as brethren in the Lord, so also, on the other hand, by speech and action, both official and unofficial, she avows a closer kinship with the churches of the Augsburg Confession. It must be admitted, however, that from some quarters she does not receive any excess of encouragement in her fraternal overtures. Her confessional attitude is criticised, sometimes savagely; and not infrequently she is misrepresented, and broad hints are given

that she is insincere, because she will not conform her practices to those of her critics; while those very practices appear to us both unnecessary and regrettable hindrances to the progress of the truth! The journey is long, indeed, from indifference and intolerance to co-operation and hearty sympathy, and our eyes may never see this journey completed: yet it is neither absurd nor impossible to expect that before the next generation will have passed away, there will be a united Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, which because of purity of doctrine, earnestness of purpose, sublimity of ideals and unswerving devotion to her Lord, will be the dominant religious power in the mightiest nation under heaven.

Furthermore, we ought, for another reason, cheerfully work in harmony with this religious tendency of our General Synod. That reason is, that our greatest opportunities to advance the kingdom of God are right through our own Church. Just as, in an army, each soldier best advances the interests of the whole host, by hearty and unstinted devotion to the interests of his own regiment and corps, so may we, by ardently cherishing a spirit of denominational loyalty, most effectively serve the Church universal: and that, without any question, must be the supreme desire of all hearts—the welfare of the Church for which Christ died.

This loyalty does not imply any claim that our Church possesses all the truth that can be known of God and His dealings with men: nor even that the truth we do know and teach is fixed beyond need or possibility of modification. The imperfection of all things earthly is far too plain for that. It implies only the belief that our teachings and practice are most nearly in accord with the revelation God has granted us, and that, when His truth is fully revealed we will have more to retain and less to modify than any other denomination. The conviction that now we know but in part, keeps us from being sectarian: the certainty that that which is perfect will come, makes us hopeful and true. We now hold and teach confidently what God has already made known to us, but we no less earnestly look for the perfect manifestation of the truth, when our little systems will have had their day and ceased to be, and the dim light, by which we now jour-

ney, will be lost in the effulgence of His glory. This is our hope: for in a far truer sense than Shelley meant,

“The One remains, the Many change and pass;
Heaven’s light forever shines; Earth’s shadows fly;
Life, like a dome of many-colored glass,
Stains the white radiance of Eternity,
Until Death tramples it to fragments.”

Columbus, Ind.

ARTICLE III.

THE CENSUS OF QUIRINIUS.

BY REV. WM. WEBER, PH.D.

According to St. Luke, Jesus was born at Bethlehem while Quirinius, governor of Syria, took the first census of Palestine. In order, therefore, to establish the date of our Savior's birth, we must find in what year and season that enrolment was made which brought his parents from Nazareth to Bethlehem. For that purpose, we must turn to the secular writers, Tacitus and Josephus.

The Roman historian devotes a whole chapter, *Ann.* III 48, to Quirinius. He writes: "About the same time, he (Tiberius) demanded from the senate that the death of Sulpicius Quirinius be honored by a public funeral. Quirinius indeed did not belong to the old patrician family of the Sulpicians since he was born in the municipium of Lavinium. But through his activity in war and important services, he had obtained under the divine Augustus the consulship and, soon after he had captured the strongholds of the Homonadensians throughout Cilicia, the honors of a triumph; he had been appointed chief adviser of C. Caesar when that young man was sent to Armenia, and had also attended Tiberius when the emperor lived at Rhodes. The latter, at that time, declared this in the senate, praised the services which the dead man had rendered to him and complained of M. Lollius whom he accused of being responsible for C. Caesar's depravity and quarrels. But the memory of Quirinius was not a source of joy to the other senators on account of the dangers plotted against Lepida and his base and powerful old age."

This chapter contains, among other things, the gist of what Tiberius said in the senate concerning Quirinius. The emperor evidently reviewed briefly the public career of his esteemed servant. That review is found in the passage, commencing with the words, "through his activity in war," and ending with "lived at Rhodes." The Latin text reads: "*Impiger militiæ*

et acribus ministeriis consulatum sub divo Augusto, mox expugnatis per Cilician Homonadensium castellis insignia triumphi adeptus, datusque rector Caio Caesari Armeniam obtinenti, Tiberium quoque Rhodi agentem coluerat."

We learn here that Quirinius, although a man of low descent, obtained through his personal merit the consulship. That happened, as we know from other sources, in the year 12 B. C. He afterwards carried on a successful war in Cilicia and was rewarded by a triumph. Next he went with young C. Caesar as chief of staff, or principal and responsible adviser, to Armenia. That was in the year 1 B. C. The last prominent position he filled was that of majordomo of the emperor Tiberius when that illustrious personage held court at Rhodes.

At the first glance, Quirinius' proconsulship of Syria does not appear to be even alluded to. But it is quite evident that this triumph over the Homonadensians must have been connected with an Asiatic proconsulship. For as he had been consul before he commanded an army, he must have been at that time governor of a proconsular province. The only two proconsular provinces whose governors could have interfered in Cilicia were Syria and Asia. Of these two Asia had no legions; a decisive reason why its governor could not wage war in Cilicia.

Thus there remains only Syria. Of that proconsular province we know that it sometimes included Cilicia. That was but natural because the inhabitants of Cilicia belonged to the same stock and spoke the same language as the people of Syria proper. "In a wider sense, the word (Syria) was used for the whole tract of country bounded by the Tigris on the east, the mountains of Armenia and Cilicia on the north, the Mediterranean on the west, and the Arabian desert on the south; the whole of which was peopled by the Aramaean branch of the great Semitic race." (Harper's Dict. of Class. Lit. & Ant.)

One is thus compelled to conclude that Quirinius was governor of Syria when he conquered the Homonadensians. Since he became afterwards the adviser of C. Caesar in Armenia, his Syrian proconsulship must date before the year 1 B. C. As we know of no other Syrian governor for the years 3 and 2 B. C., a number of prominent scholars, among them Mommsen, have come to believe that Quirinius governed Syria during those two years, just

prior to his Armenian appointment. (Cp. Schuerer, *Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes*.)

Mommsen thinks, however, that Quirinius was twice governor of Syria. He accepts a statement of Josephus according to which Quirinius as governor of Syria took a census of Palestine in A. D. 6 as conclusive evidence. But Tacitus clearly refers to only one proconsulship of Quirinius in Syria and that single proconsulship undoubtedly belongs to the last years of the pre-Christian era. As to any second Syrian governorship of Quirinius Tacitus is absolutely silent. That silence of the Roman historian does not prove directly that Quirinius cannot have been governor of Syria a second time. Still, it is hardly probable that the Roman emperors gave such rich provinces more than once to the same person. The principle of rotation in office is closely connected with the political spoils system as it prevailed in the Roman republic and empire.

Turning now to *Josephus*, we find the information we are looking for in Ant. XVII 188-XVIII 28, cp. B. J. II 1:1-9:1. That section of the *Antiquities* covers 38 pages in the edition of the works of Josephus published by Teubner and edited by Naber. It contains everything Josephus knew about the reign of Archelaos and the census of Quirinius. But his knowledge is very limited. On 29 pages, he speaks of the troubles Archelaos and Palestine had to go through before Archelaos was duly recognized as heir and successor of Herod. Only half a page is devoted to his reign of ten years. The next two pages and a half mention his banishment to Gaul and his wife's death. Less than a page, 26 lines, refer to the census of Quirinius; a page and a half, to the revolt of the Jews caused by that census. Two pages and a half render an account of the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and Zealots.

The corresponding section in the *Jewish War* is based on the same sources of information, contains the same subject matter, and is arranged in exactly the same order. Yet there are characteristic differences between the two books. The account, contained in the *Jewish War*, is considerably shorter than that in the *Antiquities*. The former impresses one as being in the main an ab-

stract of the latter. The Jewish War presents us with independent information only with regard to the religious factions of the Jews. A second important difference is found in the language. The account of Archelaos in the Jewish War reads much smoother than that in the Antiquities. The text presents hardly any difficulties. The men who translated the book into Greek were evidently excellent Greek scholars and writers. The text of the Antiquities, on the other hand, is in many places obscure. It seems to me as if we ought again and again to retranslate the Greek into Aramaic, or Syriac in order to get at the real meaning of the original text. That fact alone renders our section in the Antiquities a more original and, therefore, more reliable source than the Jewish War.

The sources on which Josephus relied and which he incorporated in his work flowed apparently with abundant richness as to the events of the first few months after Herod's demise, but failed almost entirely as to the happenings of Archelaos' reign. One can hardly be mistaken in assuming that Josephus copied the memoirs of Nicolaos of Damascus. That man conducted the case of Archelaos before Augustus and is, besides, mentioned by Josephus himself as one of his authorities. But those memoirs, or the copy of the book which Josephus possessed must have come to an abrupt end with the accession of Archelaos. Josephus added therefore a few statements derived from other and more meagre sources.

According to Ant. XVII 219, Archelaos went to Rome accompanied by the brothers Nicolaos and Ptolemaios. The latter appears to have been faithfully devoted to the interests of Archelaos. He had gone to Syria to ask the Roman proconsul Varus to hasten to Palestine and take charge of that country in the interest of Archelaos till Augustus should have confirmed the will and testament of Herod. Ant. XVII 221. When at Rome, Ptolemy delivered the petition of Archelaos and other documents relating to the estate of Herod to the emperor. Ant. XVII 228. Ptolemy's brother Nicolaos defended Archelaos before Augustus, first, against the claim made by Antipatros in behalf of Herod Antipas (Ant. XVII 240-247) and, next, against the charges presented by the Jewish embassy. Ant. XVII 315-317.

But according to Ant. XVII 224-227, Ptolemy, the brother of

Nicolaos, went to Rome with Antipas, the brother of Archelaos, in order to oppose, together with a rhetor Eirenaïos, Archelaos. Ant. XVII 228, we read of letters of Varus and Sabinus, reporting how much money had been left by Herod and how great the annual revenue of his kingdom was. Immediately before, Ant. XVII 227, however, we are told that Sabinus sent letters to Rome in which he accused Archelaos, thereby supporting the hostile mission of Antipas.

While, according to Ant. XVII 224-227, Antipas came to Rome to fight Archelaos, neither he, nor the rhetor Eirenaïos, nor Ptolemy, appear before Augustus in Ant. XVII 228 ff. A man, not mentioned before, a son of Salome, Antipatros by name pleads in favor of Antipas, who communicated with the emperor apparently through letters only. When the pleadings had come to an end, Archelaos cast himself suppliantly at the feet of Augustus. Of Antipas, who had quite as much to gain and to lose as Archelaos, not a syllable is said. That proves conclusively that he was not present. Ant. XVII 248 f.

For these reasons, it appears to me, as if Ant. XVII 224-227 does not stand in its proper place. That passage refers, as I am inclined to think, to later events when Ptolemy, the brother of Nicolaos, had ceased to be a friend of Archelaos and when Antipas as well as Sabinus made an attempt to have him removed from his tetrarchy.

Ant. XVII 249, we are told Augustus did not give a final decision immediately after hearing Antipatros and Nicolaos. Still he assured Archelaos expressly he would do nothing else but what the will of Herod prescribed and what benefited Archelaos. The will here referred to is given Ant. XVII 188-190. It appointed Antipas tetrarch of Galilee and Perea; Philip tetrarch of Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, Balanea, and Panias; Archelaos ruler of the remainder of the kingdom, Judea, Samaria, and Idumea. Salome was to receive a few cities, etc.

Archelaos had come to Rome to beseech the emperor to confirm this last will of his father in preference to an older will by which the greater part of Herod's kingdom and estate was to go to Antipas. Augustus promised at the very first hearing to recognize Herod's last will. That last will he also executed. Ant. XVII 317-320. The only important exception was that he

called Archelaos for the time being tetrarch, not king, as his father had desired. Nevertheless the emperor promised him the royal name and dignity if he should prove worthy of that honor.

At this point, the question arises why did the emperor postpone his final disposition of Herod's kingdom? The reason given, Ant. XVII 249, is certainly wrong. There we read: "He considered by himself whether he should bestow the kingdom upon Archelaos or whether it should be divided among the whole family of Herod." The question presented to the emperor was not whether Archelaos was to inherit the undivided estate and royal dignity of his father, but only which of the several wills of Herod was to be confirmed, the one favoring Archelaos, or the one favoring Antipas. Archelaos pleaded for nothing more than that the last will of his father should be executed. After Augustus had publicly and solemnly promised to recognize the testament that gave the greater share to Archelaos, the estate of Herod was settled in principle.

This settlement was not even affected by the Jewish embassy that accused Archelaos of being a tyrant and petitioned Augustus to govern Palestine directly, making it an integral part and province of the empire. Ant. XVII 304-314.

In reading Ant. XVII 317-320, it will strike us as remarkable that the emperor, when confirming Archelaos, Antipas, and Philip as tetrarchs of the different districts of their father's kingdom, fixed also their revenue or their tribute. The share of Archelaos was placed at 600 talents, that of Antipas at 200, and that of Philip at 100. The text leaves it doubtful what is really meant. Most scholars suppose the emperor permitted the sons of Herod to tax their subjects for their own revenue to the amount of 600, 200, and 100 talents respectively. But those incomes would appear rather small in view of the fabulous riches Herod the Great and his descendants are reputed to have possessed. A great Roman talent was equivalent to about \$480. Besides it is difficult to understand why Augustus should have cared to limit the revenue of the Herodian princes. They were allied rulers; and the Roman government did hardly ever interfere in the management of the ordinary, internal affairs of such dependent principalities. But they had to pay a tribute. Therefore, I suppose that the 600, 200 and 100 talents represent the tribute

which Augustus exacted for himself from the three sons of Herod.

But whether it was the tribute of Augustus or the revenue of the Herodians, the fact that the emperor fixed the amount is a sufficient explanation for the postponement of his final decision. The Roman accountants needed time for computing that tribute or revenue. Their computation was based on the reports of Varus and Sabinus which informed the emperor of both how much money Herod had left and of what the annual revenue amounted to. XVII 229. These reports of the Roman officers are clearly distinguished from the account of Herod's estate furnished by Archelaos. Ant. XVII 228. They were, besides, more comprehensive if we may rely on B. J. II 2, 4. They embraced also the resources and extent of the kingdom. All these items, however, render it almost certain that in 4 B. C. after the death of Herod a census, and that means the first census, of Palestine was taken by Sabinus.

Sabinus apparently had been sent from Rome to Palestine as soon as the news of Herod's death had been received there. He met Archelaos together with Varus just as the son of Herod was about to depart for Rome. Ant. XVII 221. At the request of Varus, he at first refrained from seizing the castles of Herod and from putting his seal upon the dead king's treasures. But he remained in Palestine and took charge of that kingdom, retaining one of the Syrian legions, while Varus returned to his province. Ant. XVII 251.

Ant. XVII 250-295 contains an account of the disturbances which broke out in Palestine while Sabinus was there and which were undoubtedly provoked by the measures he took. The Jewish revolt reached its climax at the feast of Pentecost 4 B. C. The Roman legion was attacked and besieged in Jerusalem and the temple was burned and plundered by the Romans. The rebels were men of Galilee and Perea whereas the people of Judea, Samaria, and Idumea kept aloof. The emperor therefore rewarded them by remitting one-fourth of their tribute when he confirmed the will and testament of Herod. Ant. XVII 254, 271, 293, and 319. That is a very strong indication that the disturbances had arisen on account of the census which was to fix the tribute.

But who was Sabinus? Schuerer does not enlighten us as to his identity. Josephus calls him "the procurator of Caesar in Syria." Ant. XVII 221. Harper's Class Dict. states with regard to the term procurator: "There were particular provinces which, before they were administered as actual provinces, were governed as domains by an administrator appointed by the emperor and personally responsible to him." Syria at that time, was such an imperial, not a senatorial, province of consular rank. Therefore, Sabinus was the governor of Syria who replaced and succeeded Varus.

Josephus indeed tells us that Varus was governor of Syria when Sabinus arrived in Palestine. But, nevertheless, he may have been sent to supersede Varus. We know anyhow that the governorship of the latter in Syria expired in 4 B. C.

That would account for the very tangible hostility which the report of Varus of what had happened in Palestine under Sabinus displays against Sabinus. Ant. XVII 250 ff. It explains also many other things. Sabinus acts everywhere as being the superior of Varus. When he was besieged in Jerusalem, he sent "orders," not requests, to Varus to come to his aid with the Syrian forces. Ant. XVII 256. These orders Varus obeyed, immediately and implicitly. When he had defeated the rebels in Galilee and chased away the besiegers of Sabinus, the latter left Jerusalem without deigning to meet his deliverer. Ant. XVII 244. He could not have acted in such an offensive way, if Varus had ranked him nor even if Varus had been his equal.

We thus are compelled to conclude: Sabinus was the new governor of Syria. He had been commanded by the emperor to take charge of Palestine until Augustus should have disposed of that kingdom. He had to take a census of Herod's kingdom and retained, in order to meet any trouble, one of the three Syrian legions, whereas he ordered his predecessor, Varus, to return to Syria and await there further orders until he was ready to take charge of his province in person.

I know well enough, of course, that history is ignorant as to a governor of Syria by the name of Sabinus who was appointed shortly after the death of Herod and succeeded Varus. We have learned from Tacitus that, in all probability Quirinius was the successor of Varus. But Sabinus and Quirinius may after all

be one and the same person. The memories of Nicolaos, as we possess them in the Antiquities, were translated from the Aramaic, or Syriac. In that language, the endings *ios* and *os* of Greek proper names were often entirely omitted. Noeldecke, *Syrische Gramm.* Sec. 144. If written, however, they spell both alike Wau Semkath. Cp. Lk. II 2, Syriac New Test., Am. Bible Soc. *Quirinius* then spells in Syriac: Qof, Wau, Resh, Nun, Wau, Semkath; *Sabinus*: Semkath, Beth, Nun, Wau, Semkath. Qof and Wau, if written a little too close together, look exactly like Semkath. Resh and Beth are quite as easily confounded in Nestorian script. Their chief distinguishing mark is nothing but a little dot placed above the Resh. In Nestorian script, the two names Quirinius and Sabinus could therefore be confounded very easily. Of course, it should have to be proved that the script of Josephus' copy of the memoirs of Nicolaos was the Nestorian, or, at least, resembled it. Thus I can claim for this hypothesis only a more or less remote possibility.

The end of Ant. XVII and the beginning of book XVIII present disconnected and in part, at least, contradictory statements about the history of Palestine. The account of Nicolaos, used by Josephus, evidently did not cover that period. Ant. XVII 355, we read that the country of Archelaos was added as a tributary district to the province of Syria. Schuerer makes three different attempts to explain and modify that statement. For after the banishment of Archelaos, his country was as a matter of fact not joined to Syria, but put directly under the government of the Roman emperor, who sent a procurator of equestrian rank to govern that country. Josephus himself tells us: "Copinius, a man of equestrian rank, is sent along with him to govern the Jews with absolute power." Ant. XVIII 2.

Another difficulty is caused by the verb ἀποδομι which occurs not less than three times. We first learn: "Quirinius, a man of consular rank, is sent by the emperor to take a census of the property in Syria and to ἀποδοσόμενος the country of Archelaos." Ant. XVII 355. Shortly afterwards we are informed: "Quirinius came into Judea which had become an addition to Syria in order to take a census of their property and to ἀποδοσόμενος the money of Archelaos." Ant. XVIII 2. The same statement

is repeated, Anti XVIII 26. "Quirinius had ἀποδόμενος the money of Archelaos and the census had come to an end."

What does ἀποδίδομι mean in these passages? The original meaning of the active voice of the verb is: "to give up, to give back, to restore, to return." The middle voice signifies very often: "to sell", occasionally it denotes also: "to farm out the taxes." While, in the first instance, we could accept the meaning "farm out the taxes," the two parallel passages render this meaning unacceptable. The meaning "to sell" fits none of the passages. In the LXX, the middle voice of ἀποδίδομι has frequently the same meaning as the active voice, namely, "to return, to give back, to turn over." Josephus accordingly would inform us three times in succession that Quirinius returned either the country of Archelaos, or his money, of course, to Archelaos.

The only thing which prevents us from immediately accepting this as the true meaning of those passages is the explicit assertion given Ant. XVIII 26 that this returning of Archelaos' land, or property took place in A. D. 6. But, in that year, Archelaos was deprived of his tetrarchy and sent as exile to Gaul. The Jewish War informs us that, at the same time, he was deprived of his personal property. II 7:3. According to Ant. XVII 344, he took his money along. The grammatical subject of that sentence is indeed the emperor and "his" refers to Archelaos. But, if it were not for the statement found in the J. W., I think most Commentators would find that the real subject is Archelaos, that, in other words, he was deprived only of his political power not of his private fortune.

Yet, in any case, that assertion does not agree with what we learned about the returning of his land and money by Quirinius. If his principality and his wealth were both taken away and confiscated, they were not returned to him in A. D. 6 by Quirinius. If, when going into banishment, he took his money along, it could not be returned to him afterwards.

Upon these perplexities, a very curious light falls from Ant. XVIII 27. There we read: "But Herod," that is Antipas, "and Philip received each his tetrarchy and entered upon his reign. And Herod built walls around Sepphoris, the principal place of all Galilee, and made it his capital." These words

clearly refer, not to the events of A. D. 6, but to what happened in 4 B. C.

We therefore have a perfect right to assume that the immediately preceding statement about the return of Archelaos' money, or Archelaos' principality, belongs to the same year, 4 B.C. That will give a very good sense. We learned Ant. XVII 233 that Sabinus took charge of the castles and treasures of Archelaos after Herod's death. But when Archelaos had been recognized by Augustus, his inheritance was, of course, restored to him by the Roman governor. But if that is true, Sabinus and Quirinius must be identical. That we found before to be not improbable.

But in Ant. XVIII 26 the statements that Archelaos received his possessions and that his brothers entered upon the administration of their tetrarchies, are separated by the remark that this happened in the thirty-seventh year after the defeat of Antonius at Actium by Caesar, i. e., in the year A. D. 6. That is an impossible date. Its appearance at its present place, however, may be accounted for. It has been inserted either by Josephus himself or by one of his early readers. Josephus, of course, did not know that the passage under discussion refers to the beginning of the reign of Archelaos. Otherwise, he would have either omitted it altogether or put it where it belonged. Being under the impression that the passage told of what had occurred in A. D. 6, he could easily be tempted to add that date. The same thing may have been done by one of his early readers who possessed sufficient historical knowledge. The fact that the date is entirely out of place is not affected by its possible origin.

We are now perhaps enabled to explain the statement Ant. XVII 355 that the land of Archelaos was joined and made subject to Syria. This was not a permanent measure. It means only, after Herod's death the new governor of Syria was entrusted by Augustus with the management of his kingdom, its census, etc., until the emperor should have made up his mind what to do with Palestine.

There are a number of other indications to this same effect, proving that the first paragraphs of Ant. XVIII refer to the same events which are related Ant. XVII 219. Spitta has already called attention to double mention of the high priest, Jozazar. Ant. XVII 164, XVIII 3, XVII 339, XVIII 26. He

also refers briefly to Judas. One of the men that arose after Herod's death against Sabinus was Judas. Ant. 271-272. He seized the Galilean city of Sepphoris and Varus had to dispatch a separate expedition under his son to suppress the revolt in Galilee and capture Sepphoris. Ant. XVII 288 f. According to Ant. XVIII 4-10, Quirinius when taking his census was opposed by Judas. The opinion has been repeatedly expressed that these two Judases are not only identical but that also their two revolts are but one and the same thing. That again would prove that Sabinus and Quirinius are the same person.

This supposition is directly confirmed by the words we find Ant. XVIII 8: "This revolt destroyed even the temple of God through the fire of the enemies." "This revolt" is that of Judas. We do not know of any destruction of the temple in the year A. D. 6. The words just quoted refer quite as little to the destruction of the temple in A. D. 70. But we learn from Ant. XVII 261-264: "The Romans, angry at what was done, set fire to the porticoes without the Jews who stood upon them noticing it. This fire fed by many hands with those things that can start a flame, quickly seized the roof. Since this consisted of wood impregnated with pitch and wax, the gold also being besmeared with wax, it at once became a prey of the flames. Those vast and famous works were destroyed and unexpected ruin overtook the men that were on the porticoes. Some were carried down with the roof when it collapsed; others were slain by the surrounding enemies; many, in despair of their life and in fear of their present terrible fate, hurled themselves into the fire or made an escape by falling upon their swords. All those who afterwards tried to escape, going down by the way by which they had ascended, the Romans slew since they were unarmed and had lost their senses, their reckless courage being of no avail to help them since they had no weapons. Not a single one of those who had climbed on the roof got away. But the Romans rushed through the fire wherever that was possible and seized the treasury in which the sacred money was kept. And much was stolen by the soldiers; but Sabinus saved openly for himself 400 talents."

I have stated above that this attack upon the Roman legion was not the work of the people of Jerusalem and Judea but rather of the Galileans; and that the emperor in order to reward

the loyalty of the southern districts at this occasion remitted one-fourth of their tribute. That demonstrates finally that the beginning of book XVIII treats of exactly the same events as Ant. XVII 221 ff.

The census taken by Quirinius was, in spite of Ant. XVII 355 and XVIII 1, a strictly local Palestinian census. That is not contradicted by Lk. II 1. Spitta considers the word *οικουμένη* there as a mistake of the translator. We find exactly the same mistake Ant. XIV 7:2. There the great treasures found by Crassus in the temple of Jerusalem are accounted for by the following words: "All the Jews and proselytes of the *οικουμένη*, in addition however also those of Asia and Europe contributed to it from very ancient times." Since *οικουμένη* is here placed in opposition to Asia and Europe, it can denote neither the entire world nor the whole empire. It means only Palestine, the country of the Jews, and stands for the Hebrew word *ארץ*.

Josephus, just as Tacitus, vouches only for one governorship of Quirinius over Syria. If, therefore, the notice of Lk. II 2 is correct—and I do not see any reason why we should doubt it—Jesus was born in the year 4 B. C.

But we are enabled to define that time even more definitely. Herod died in the month of March of that year. Quirinius arrived in Palestine shortly after Easter. Ant. XVII 213, 221. Pentecost denotes the highwater mark of the revolt of Judas of Galilee. Ant. XVII 254 ff. By that time, the census had been completed in the southern districts of Palestine, which had not joined in the revolt of the northern parts. Therefore Jesus must have been born about the feast of Pentecost of the year 4 B. C. The 15th of May is possibly his birthday.

People have asked: Why did Joseph take his wife along to Bethlehem? The reason is not far to seek. In the first place, Joseph submitted to the census. That proves he did not belong to the fanatical zealots who sided with Judas. Nazareth was hardly five miles south of Sepphoris. It would have been extremely unsafe for Mary to have stayed in Nazareth while Joseph had gone to Bethlehem in obedience to the summons of Quirinius. Josephus mentions expressly the murder of fellow-citizens—*φόνος πόλιτικός*—and intertribal slaughter—*ἐμφύλιοι σφαγαί*—as one of the features of Judas' revolt. Ant. XVIII 8. If Jesus

was born about the 15th day of May 4 B. C., his parents could safely return to Nazareth forty or fifty days later. By that time, the revolt had been crushed and law and order restored in Galilee.

Pittsburg, Pa.

ARTICLE IV.

IS HISTORY RATIONAL?

BY CHARLES W. SUPER.

History is the record and interpretation of psychic forces as manifested in acts and institutions. This is the usual sense in which the term is used. But it may also signify the course of human affairs. While it is true that *affairs* can neither be studied nor their relation to each other be interpreted without such a record except in so far as the human memory retains them, we often hear the term *history* employed as if this were possible. We are here, however, concerned with affairs in the somewhat restricted sense implied in the second signification, and purpose to consider whether those forces, be they individual or social, that have determined the course of events, have, on the whole tended to bring into prominence and dominance those factors in human conduct that we are wont to designate as rational. At first blush this may seem a self-evident proposition. Few men will deny that the world has been growing better for at least six or seven centuries; if not the entire human race, at least that portion which we may designate broadly as coming under European influences. There has been a clearly marked tendency toward a lessening of the inequalities among men and therefore a growth of the spirit of social and political justice. There is less abject poverty; the spread of disease has been for the most part prevented; there are hardly any widely destructive famines; there has been a spread of the spirit of brotherly love among men that is no longer bounded by race, nationality, or condition; wars have gradually becoming less frequent, less prolonged, and less destructive of life and property.

From these and other facts that might be adduced we are naturally led to conclude that the amount of unhappiness has been diminished. Albeit, we can not affirm this positively because we have no standard by which we can measure human feelings. While, then, most persons who have given the problem careful thought are ready to declare and maintain that the world has

been growing less miserable and likewise more ethical, there are names of weight ranged on the opposite side. Among these we may mention Macchiaiavelli and the whole school of modern pessimists, Schopenhauer, Hartmann, Hellwald, and not a few others. They maintain that affairs move in cycles under the influence of physical laws by a natural process in which it is impossible to discern any definite goal. According to these philosophers, history is entirely non-teleological. Many of the leading French historians incline more or less to the same view. On the other hand, the teleological conception of history was defended by Herder, Kant, William von Humboldt, Hegel and others in the last century together with many of more recent date. Most of the English writers who have dealt with historical subjects are at least meliorists, if not strict construction teleologists. They admit that although the social forces are largely under the dominance of physical laws, these laws may, nevertheless, to a considerable extent, be controlled by human volition, and that it is through the agency of this volition that teleological ends are more or less definitely attained, even if not clearly had in view. The late Professor Freeman declared, in his inaugural lecture at Oxford, "If there be any object beyond, higher than the search after truth for its own sake, it will be the hope that our studies of the past may be found after all to have their use in the living present." In the same strain Mr. Froude assures his readers that "injustice and falsehood may be long lived, but doomsday comes at last to them." Thomas Carlyle affirms that "of all Bibles, the frightfullest to disbelieve in is this Bible of Universal History." Much more testimony of the same sort might be adduced from British writers. The belief in the moral order of human affairs is so deeply ingrained in the Anglo-Saxon conception of the trend of events that it crops out constantly in almost every writer who deals with social conditions. I do not recall the name of an English novelist of note, unless it be the author of *Wuthering Heights*, in whose writings virtue does not finally triumph over vice. In his Introduction to *Ivanhoe* Sir Walter Scott defends himself against some of his "fair readers" for not assigning the hand of Wilfred to Rebecca rather than to the less interesting Rowena. After indulging on some reflections on the criticisms he reminds us that the consciousness

of a high-minded discharge of duty produces a peace within which the world can neither give nor take away. The British poets, on the whole, teach and even preach the same doctrine. For this they have been reproached by French critics on the ground that it is a violation of the canons of true art. In striking contrast is the tone of English political literature. It is largely denunciatory and pessimistic. No matter what party is in power, a considerable portion of the press seems to take it for granted that things are going from good to bad or from bad to worse. Perhaps it is owing to this penchant for washing dirty political linen in public that the linen of the Anglo-Saxon people is relatively clean. You can no more purify the public linen by hiding its evils than you can wash and dry linen cloth in a closet. We have here a pronounced conviction that there is a wide-spread belief in the rectitude of public opinion; in the conviction that there is such a thing as a public conscience; and that if a public wrong is to be perpetuated it can only be successfully done if kept from public knowledge. If the almost universal belief that the increase of wealth promotes the happiness of individuals and communities, which is the same thing in the end since communities are nothing more than aggregates of individuals, is a delusion, it is a delusion that ought to be encouraged. There is no subjective difference between the man who thinks he is well off and the man who is well off. Besides, with the growth of intelligence with the deepening of insight, and with the increase of knowledge, the belief in the efficacy of knowledge keeps pace. If all this leads to nothing we are confronted with exactly the opposite of what takes place in every other field of human activity: the more we know the more confirmed becomes our delusion. With the passing years the number of persons who devote themselves to research is steadily increasing. Some of these are no doubt led almost solely by the desire for wealth; but there is an increasingly large number who seek their chief glory in being benefactors to the human race. The stream of public beneficence is also constantly swelling. Governments, too, are coming more and more to recognize it as a part of their obligations to promote the public welfare in the widest sense of the term. Statesmanship in the modern sense no longer means the aggrandizement of one country at the expense of every other,

but the promotion of the well-being of the human race. The whole world has become, in a sense, a brotherhood. Public opinion has become a force which all governments feel they must reckon with, even when it is no position to do them any direct harm. The real statesman is the man who does most to advance the welfare of his country without regard to himself. If a man at the head of affairs is bent on private gain he does not make the fact public because he knows that the avowal of selfishness will injure, if not destroy entirely, his prestige. No candidate for a public office will openly admit that his chief reason for seeking it is its emoluments. Public opinion is not now and never has been wholly altruistic; but it is more nearly so at the present time than ever before. Especially noteworthy has been the advance within the last three or four decades. It permeates the whole of society. The more men come to know of each other the more sympathetic they become. But the query arises whether men may not sometimes be mistaken; whether they may not be guided by ethical motives in their devotion to an unethical or at least an unjust cause. The answer must be an unqualified yes. However, when such is the case it is due to ignorance, sometimes quasi-intentional, sometimes unavoidable. Men may ignorantly block the wheels of progress for a time, or they may sacrifice themselves in vain attempts to sustain a cause that is doomed to destruction. We saw this fact strikingly exemplified in the war between the States for the Union. The people of the South did not merely believe they were right: they were convinced of it. They willingly, even cheerfully, made sacrifices for their cause on a larger scale than had ever been done before. They achieved results that were little short of marvelous, with the resources at command, because so little was wasted. If, therefore, a cause ought to win which is defended by sincerely devoted men and women, the South ought to have won; and in this case all the more for the reason that the military management of the North was more or less tainted with corruption and supported by many persons from purely mercenary motives. The men who received contracts for furnishing army supplies were for the most part a bad lot. The people of the South were handicapped by ignorance. They did not, because they would not, discern the signs of the times. They lacked insight because they purposely

excluded from their section the means by which insight could be gained. They willfully believed a lie and were damned accordingly before the world's tribunal, just as they will forever stand condemned before the tribunal of history.

Under somewhat similar conditions, yet in other aspects widely different, Demosthenes and his friends sacrificed themselves for a cause that in the nature of the case could not win. They endeavored to accomplish ends for which the human material was inadequate. While therefore we can not but admire his energy and patriotism, we have much reason to believe that if he had succeeded in arresting the career of Philip the cause of progress would not have been advanced. Very often, as in the case of the Gracchi, a cause wins in the end, although its earliest champions become the victims of its opponents. It has happened time and again in English politics that sweeping economic changes were brought about by the party that had been elected for the distinct purpose of opposing them.

Let us return to the ancient world. The early Greek writers who composed histories, or who touched incidentally upon historical themes, incline to the materialistic view of events, or at least to the theory of cycles. We have no means of gauging the extent of their knowledge of "barbarian" affairs owing to their contempt for everything non-Hellenic. Although they were for centuries in almost uninterrupted intercourse with Persians and many Greeks are known to have spoken the Persian language as well as other non-Hellenic tongues, they regarded such an accomplishment as a purely practical matter. Consequently had it not been for discoveries made in the nineteenth century the speech of the ancient Persians would have been a sealed book to us. In the light of the modern science their narrowness was justifiable. There is no progress of any kind discernable in ancient Egypt or Mesopotamia. The earliest records exhibit a state of civilization as advanced as the latest; in some respects rather more advanced. Herodotus, for his part, is convinced that his countrymen prevailed over the barbarians—the few over the many, the weak in resources over those possessing unlimited resources—because they were *better*. Plato lived in a degenerate age; the tone of many of his writings is tinged with a sombre hue. He is less of an optimist than his distinguished master.

He can hardly have thought that his ideal republic could ever become a reality. Like St. Augustine, he seems to have dreamed in a half-waking state, of a commonwealth that was not of earth. Yet he saw clearly that human conditions are, in the main, due to human volition. How far he believed the doctrine of necessity to be true is lucidly set forth in the Republic. He regards the routine of good actions and good habits as an inferior sort of goodness. "Virtue is free, and as a man honors or dishonors her he will have more or less of her." "Although life is rounded out by necessity and there are circumstances prior to birth just as there are conditions amid which his life is passed that he can not materially change;" yet within the wall of necessity there is an open space in which he is his own master and can study for himself the effects which the variously compounded gifts of nature or fortune have upon the soul, and act accordingly. "All men can not have the first choice in everything. But the lot of all men is good enough, if they choose wisely and will live diligently." Plato seems to have vaguely felt what St. Paul expressed with profound spiritual discernment several centuries later: "We know, indeed, that all nature alike has been groaning in the pains of labor up to this very hour. And not nature only; but we ourselves also, though possessing in the spirit an earnest study of the future—we ourselves I say, are inwardly groaning, while we wait for the privilege as sons—I mean the redemption of our bodies. In this hope we are saved." The Roman historians wrote under a feeling of despondency; the Greeks of the same period are hopeful. They recognized that Rome brought a certain kind of peace to their warring and unruly countrymen, thus affording them leisure to devote their energies to other pursuits. Polybius is convinced that Roman arms prevailed because the Roman people were worthier than their opponents. Diolorus declares that history is a benefactress for all time, the herald of truth, the mother of philosophy, and a promoter of righteousness. Plutarch wrote a series of biographies for the avowed purpose of inculcating and emphasizing the moral teachings of history. Sallust, although, a Roman, writes in the same strain. He sneers at those who attribute their misfortunes and their evil deeds to the decrees of fate. He tells his countrymen that their ills are due to wickedness rather than

weakness, and declares if men were not perverse they would be far less unfortunate. The Greeks, however, overlooked the important fact that when their countrymen were prevented from developing their energies by fighting they failed also to cultivate that which was most characteristically their own, that which gave to them pre-eminence among the nations of antiquity, and in fact among all the nations of the earth. They were like many a man who is a useful citizen so long as he has to struggle against poverty, but who becomes virtually worthless after he has attained affluence.

It will forever remain a mystery why the western half of the Roman empire declined and fell in the early Christian centuries. The mystery deepens when we recall that the eastern half, which was beset by more powerful enemies, generally held its own and sometimes a little more for almost a thousand years longer. A proximate cause was the decline of civic virtue due to the rise and spread of a cosmopolitan religion. But the secret lies deeper. Some agency must have prepared the minds of men for the acceptance of such a religion. Moreover all modern historians are agreed that there was a marked moral or reformation in the second century that had not the slightest connection with Christianity. That the same institutions which carried a nation to the highest pitch of power against peoples with well organized military forces; that this nation developed a system of law which is still the admiration of the world, and that influenced to a greater or less extent every legal code of modern Europe, should perish by its own inherent weakness gives the student of history much food for reflection but few data for the solution of the enigma. Modern nations, too, have had their periods of decline; but almost without exception they have developed within themselves recuperative powers which eventually brought about their restoration. Even in cases where territory and political prestige were lost the people suffered no permanent detriment in material prosperity. But the Roman empire was destroyed, in branch, if not wholly in root. About a thousand years may be dropped from the history of European affairs without being seriously missed so far as progress is concerned. It is not till the men of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were placed in position to take up the thoughts evolved by the Western empire that the

world began to move forward again, at first very slowly, then more rapidly. But there were serious breaks and interruptions everywhere. Germany, after reaching a commanding position, fell to a subordinate place, and later relapsed into a condition of impotence. The career of Spain somewhat later was similar. The turn of France came next, to say nothing of some of the minor powers. England alone is in a great measure an exception. The late Carl Hillebrand says in one of his essays: "English history, intellectual as well as political, is like a beautiful work of art. Clearer, more definite in outline, more united and more logical in its fundamental character, more complete and more exhaustive in action and development, a classical drama could not be." Although this is somewhat of an overstatement, it is true in the main; it is especially valuable as the testimony of a competent foreigner. At any rate, the affirmation could not be made of any other country. There is, moreover, some reason for believing that in certain portions of Europe there was a degree of progress and a fair measure of prosperity between 500 and 1500, A. D. Much of the Iberian peninsula was in a highly flourishing condition before the age of Ferdinand and Isabella. M. Rambaud endorses the conclusions reached by some eminent French statisticians to the effect that the population of their country during the Middle Age was equal to what it is now; and that the subsequent decline was due to the devastation and famine caused by the Hundred Years' War, and to pestilence. Besides, during this long period of stagnation of a certain kind, the Germanic races were transformed with considerable rapidity into material from which well-ordered states were to be constructed. The contrast with the "unchanging East" has often been remarked. The poet was probably not far wrong when he declared that fifty years of Europe were better than a cycle of Cathay. Our direct knowledge of spiritual and immaterial agencies is so limited; we are so much in the dark as to their modes of operation that we are always on insecure ground when we venture to predict anything positive concerning them. But we are reasonably safe in assuming that they are an innate force working in harmony with man's intellect and will, and not an external agency. This postulate is in accord with the universal belief in human responsibility, an assumption upon which every

organized society is based. On any other postulate all governments are a gigantic fraud,—government would in fact be impossible. That modern society is teleological and is on the whole moving forward toward a higher level, toward a betterment of all classes, toward a fuller measure of social justice for a constantly increased proportion of the body politic, the most rabid pessimist does not deny. That this general trend is to the advantage of all concerned is universally recognized and admitted. Albeit, when we contemplate the ancient world the theory seems to break down. Pre-Christian times, outside of Greece and Rome, contributed little that is of service to the modern world. Rome borrowed much from Greece, but Greece borrowed very little from earlier ages and alien peoples, Herodotus to the contrary notwithstanding. With the exception of some elementary principles in geometry, and our modes of measuring time, space, and weight, it is doubtful whether any contribution from the East still survives among us except the monotheism of the Semites together with some consequences flowing from the belief. Perhaps those early conditions were a negative sort of preparation, a grouping in the dark, a seeking for light where it could not be found and in a direction where there was only darkness. "A thousand years in thy sight are but one day." Assuming that the cosmos will return to primeval chaos after a some hundreds of thousand years, the human race may have accomplished much in that period. The "divine event" may be far off and yet be just ahead of us all the time, not as a delusion but as a condition that is in process of realization all the time. The will to live may, to some extent, be a blind force; but no one will affirm that it is so blind that it can not distinguish between living well and living better. It can not fail to apprehend intellectually the means by which the *better* is to be attained, and that it is not a mere matter of live and let live, but a goal to be reached by human effort.

When we speak of time and space as being without limit we probably know what we are trying to say, but it can hardly be affirmed that we are fully cognizant of what we mean. The human race has had some experience with duration, but it is infinitesimally small. The same is true of the denizens of the solar system as to space; it is a very insignificant part of the universe.

We are not better off when we affirm anything about matter or force or spirit. It is by no means certain that matter exists. Be that as it may, that anything exists without having had a beginning is wholly at variance with the categories of the mind. We can not conceive of anything except as having had a beginning at some time and in some place. We are merely certain that we are here and that our ancestors for two or three hundred centuries were here before us. Yet we may be said to belong to the beginnings of the human race.

It is reasonably certain that human beings have from the first possessed a measure of rationality, however small. They have always, in a feeble way, it is true, striven toward betterment. They have used tools, something which no mere animal ever does. Men have profited, however little it may have been, by their own experience and that of their fellows. Each generation has, on the whole, not been obliged to follow precedent blindly in everything, as do the beaver, the ant, the bee, and some other creatures. There has evidently been some progress somewhere in the world even if it has not been continuous and without serious interruptions. We know nothing about the beginnings of life; but we are safe in assuming, on the basis of extant evidence, that even in the realm of biology, there has been an advance, the higher succeeding and displacing the lower. Whether this advance was due to a force inherent in animal life, or external thereto is also beyond our ken. The effect in either case would have produced the same results. We can therefore speak of it as a fact, or at least a logical inference.

While we are completely in the dark as to the beginnings of the human race, or even of life, we can hardly refuse to believe that from the very first there must have been in the primitive group some men who were a little more farsighted, a trifle more competent to adapt means to ends, a little more rational than their fellows, and that this class slowly increased in numbers as well as in influence. The stone age was followed by the age of bronze, this again by the age of iron, and so on in ever widening circles. Professor James has admirably stated the mode of operation of this psychic influence in the following words: "The mutations of societies from generation to generation, are in the main due directly or indirectly to the acts or examples of indi-

viduals whose genius was so adapted to the receptivities of the moment, or whose accidental position of authority was so critical that they became ferments, initiators of movement, setters of precedent or fashion, centers of corruption, or destroyers of other persons, whose gifts, had they had free play, would have led society in another direction." Although these initiators of movement may have followed a blind instinct, it was an instinct that was directed toward betterment. It impelled toward an end that was never attained, toward a goal that was always just ahead. It was not an end complete in itself like that which impels a bird to build a nest, in which case each generation begins exactly where its predecessor began and ends where its predecessor ended. Not infrequently apparent retrogression eventuates in progress. Just across the street is a building that has stood for almost a century, in process of demolition. Soon the site will be a vacant plot of ground. But in a few years a new structure will occupy the location of the old one. The process of demolition was, therefore, an indispensable prerequisite of construction, or in this particular case, of reconstruction. I doubt whether we can affirm more of the course of human events as a whole. Our race has had to work out its own salvation. If God governs the world, or guides human or terrestrial affairs, however indirectly, he evidently does so only in so far as the divine reason operates as human will which is at least to an appreciable extent a free will. The assumption on which all human associations from the highest to the lowest is based is that man is responsible and accountable. The degree of this responsibility or accountability is not determined by himself solely but by ancestry, by antecedent and contemporary conditions. If we do not accept this postulate and regard the psychic universe as a mere machine, human reason is nothing more than an attribute of matter. All that has been said and written as well as everything that may be said and written on this subject is mere idle verbiage. Human activity and human effort are nothing more than a beating of the air. They may serve as a pastime but with that they end. Morality is a delusion and man the most unfortunate part of the sentient creation. If the study of history has any value it must be mainly practical. We have no guide for the future but the past. If the past does not demonstrate that honesty and straight-

forwardness are better than duplicity, veracity than falsehood, self-denial than carnal self-gratification, the human race is far more unfortunate than the beasts of the field, because millions of men have lived and died under a delusion. The wise man is the shrewd man, the man who makes the most of the passing hour, since all his efforts to better his fellow men are futile. The mechanical theory of psychic forces puts human conduct on exactly the same plane with instinct. Alcibiades showed better judgment and lived more for a purpose than Socrates, Petronius than St. Paul. If a man happens to feel it his duty or his inclination to tell the truth, to keep his word, to do unto others as he would be done by, he is pursuing a phantom as unreal as the phantasmagoria that delude the victims of a diseased brain. I am aware that all this is no argument to the pessimist. He not only admits but declares that man is the most unfortunate of living beings because he is now just as he always has been pursuing phantoms. As the poet expresses it: "He never is, but always to be blest." Yet by strange inconsistency the pessimist manages to get a great deal of satisfaction out of this mundane existence. He is often an amiable person. He tells the truth; he is a man of honor; he obeys the laws of his country and strives for their improvement; he provides for his family, if he has one, —in short, he acts just as if he were dealing with reality. If the men who do these things are laboring under a delusion, he willfully, if not wickedly, encourages this delusion and is *particeps criminis* in a fraud. If there is one lesson that history teaches with solemn impressiveness above all others, it is that in the long-run virtue is rewarded and vice punished: not always, perhaps not generally, in the individual, it is true, but in the group. We are so bound up and enmeshed in the mass of which we are a part that the best men among us have to suffer for the weakness and the wickedness of the worst and most inefficient. But, conversely, we are also the beneficiaries of the good deeds and heartening words, of the self-sacrifice, the altruism of those who lived before us, in the case of some men many centuries before us. Plutarch, although living in a degenerate age, recognized this debt very clearly. St. Paul frequently touches upon the same theme.

If we scrutinize carefully our own lives—we need not go out-

side the limits of our own experience—we soon discover that four-fifths of the ills that have come upon us are due to human volition, and therefore preventible by the same agency. We suffer far more from the faults of others than from their misfortunes. If the conduct of our fellow-men were more generally influenced by ethical and rational considerations every community would be the better and happier for it. Looking at conditions and circumstances in a large way we are not free to act; but every man is free to act within the limits of his own personality. It is probable that there are but few men who would not rather do right than wrong: in fact there would presumably be very few of the latter class if the majority were not so constituted as to prefer a nearer tangible good to a remoter but more general good. St. Paul's experience is of a piece with that of mankind: "When I would do good, evil is present with me." Seneca persistently confesses the same inner conflict. Even the Epicurean Ovid declares that he perceives the better and approves but follows the worse.

Admitting that life persists solely because of an unconscious will to live, we must concede at least so much rationality to human beings that they desire to live as well as possible. Francis Lieber long ago dwelt upon the fact that man's natural state is one of civilization and progress, and that the condition of nature so eloquently portrayed by Rousseau and his school is at variance with human experience. Except in rare and isolated instances men do not voluntarily descend in the social scale; they find the higher stage more congenial and consequently more natural than the lower. John Stuart Mill has put the case in his usual vigorous manner when he says: "Few human creatures would consent to be changed into any of the lower animals for a promise of the fullest allowance of the beast's pleasures." "Whoever supposes that the preference takes place at a sacrifice—that the superior being in anything like equal circumstances, is not happier than the inferior—confounds two very different ideas of happiness, and content."

It may be regarded as a noteworthy phenomenon in the history of human thought that the idea of a theodicy was not formally elaborated until the beginning of the eighteenth century. Yet the political and social condition of Europe at that date was

not such as to justify the optimism of Leibniz. His work was, in fact, the result of philosophical thought, not a deduction from existing circumstances. It is however none the less valuable for that. If the idea of a theodicy is grounded upon reason it must stand the test of adverse as well as of favorable conditions. If we go back in mind to ancient times we find that the interests of men were almost exclusively centered on the affairs of this world. The Egyptian doctrine of a future life seems to have had no influence upon the religion or polity of the ancient Jews. Happiness, according to the ideas prevailing in their primitive commonwealth, was assumed to consist entirely in worldly possessions. We do not know even approximately the age to which the Book of Job belongs; and while it clearly teaches that righteousness is rewarded, its rewards are purely temporal. This drama or epic (it partakes of the nature of both)—for whatever be its date it can hardly be later than the time of Plato—is a conspicuous landmark in the development of human thought. It shows clearly that the idea of a moral order in the affairs of men, an order guided by an omnipotent Governor, had already fixed itself firmly in the minds of some thinkers. Nor is it unreasonable to suppose that the book has a historical basis like the Homeric Poems. It is perhaps also reasonable to expect that such a justification of the ways of God to man should find its earliest exponent and clearest enunciation among monotheists. For although the Greek philosophers may be placed in this class they were never able to free themselves entirely from the influence of the polytheism that found such manifold expression in the popular creed.

The general tone of Ecclesiastes is that of a man who had had a wide and varied experience of life and had found no real satisfaction in any sphere; yet his conclusion is that the only true happiness consists in the consciousness of having lived an upright life. The New Testament insists upon the supreme importance of taking into account as existence after death, in the regulation of our conduct here. In this respect it is wholly at variance with the Old. The Greeks had no doubt of the existence of the soul after death; but they pictured that existence in very sombre colors. To them it furnished no compensations for wrongs and injustice suffered in the body. Albeit, the story of

Glaucus as told by Herodotus shows plainly that however little influence such a belief may have had upon the popular mind, some men had formed a clear idea of a moral order in the affairs of men and that those who violate this order must pay the penalty for such violation in this life.

The belief in God as a just judge gradually afforded stronger and stronger consolation to the mass of men as their condition kept growing worse. To St. Paul and many of his co-religionists the sufferings of this life were not to be compared with the glory that should follow. But toward the close of the Middle Age when commerce began to show some signs of revival; when the economic conditions of some portions of Europe had improved a little; when a man here and there began to have some conception, however slight, of the existence of economic laws: then communities here and there likewise began to pay a little more attention to betterment in this world and less to a preparation for the next. Most of the Humanists, especially the Italians, were thoroughgoing worldlings. Petrarch's letters are full of scorn for those who have no desire to leave behind them anything by which they may be remembered among men. However little Leibniz may have been influenced by his immediate surroundings he found enough in them to justify a theodicy. Besides there had been thinkers not much anterior to his own times whose thoughts were the precursors of his. Among the greatest, if not the greatest, was Sir Thomas More. More is a fine example of the class of men that have appeared at intervals, sometimes when and where one would least expect them, who were endowed in a high degree with the "projected efficiency" which made them not only spectators of all time but which enabled them likewise to discern spiritually the lines along which alone the course of human affairs must advance, if there was to be no retrogression. Such men are a noble tribute to the rational instinct, if we may so call it, which gave them the innate force to rise above the circumstances amid which they lived and with far-seeing eye to discern in the dim distance the light toward which the human race will move with less and less faltering steps as the ages roll by. That so many of their theories have been gradually and almost unconsciously incorporated into our civic life is an earnest that it is not only becoming ever more rational but

also more ethical. It is hard to understand how a man can be a consistent theist, or even deist without believing in a moral order and in a God as a promoter of that order. His plans may be frustrated again and again by the free-agency of man, but they cannot be entirely and permanently thrown into inextricable confusion.

We have seen that St. Paul did not believe that the world was rational in any extended sense until the coming of Christ. But he can only have meant that the rational forces were not dominant; he was too much of a Jew to believe otherwise. There were ages of grouping in darkness during which some men saw the light, dimly it may be, but they felt that there was a light somewhere, little as their influence had to do with the shaping of affairs. The prevailing note in the writings of the prophets is one of sorrow over the perversity of their countrymen. These were the times which God overlooked, or "winked at." The idea of a Redeemer, the consciousness, the need of a Saviour, presupposes that there exists somewhere a new source of illumination. The old order had been tried and found wanting, just as it was found wanting in the Roman empire outside of Christianity. A world capable of redeeming itself had no need of a divinely commissioned Redeemer. We are here face to face with a philosophical and moral no less than with a theological fact. There was a marked moral renaissance in the second century of the Christian era chiefly owing to the influence of philosophy. This revival seems however not to have seriously affected the people as a whole. It appears chiefly in the written literature of the time and probably interested only a small portion of the community. On the other hand, the nascent church, or rather, nascent Christianity, set to work diligently at the other end of the social scale and in time became much more widely effective. It was the ignored lower stratum that knew nothing of philosophy and cared nothing, which was chiefly aroused. During the first four centuries the Church produced some great men. This fact has been forcibly stated by the Rev. Charles Kingsley in the preface of *Hypatia*. A brief extract is all there is room for here. "The general intermixture of idea, creeds, and races, even the mere physical facilities for intercourse between the different parts of the empire, helped to give the great Christian fathers of the

fourth and fifth centuries a breadth of observation, a depth of thought, a large-hearted and large-minded tolerance and patience such as, we may say boldly, the Church has since beheld but rarely, and the world never; at least, if we may judge those great men by what they had, and not by what they had not, and to believe, as we are bound, that had they lived now, and not then, they would have towered as far above the heads of this generation as they did above the heads of their own. And thus an age which to the shallow insight of a sneerer like Gibbon, seems only a rotting and aimless chaos of sensuality and anarchy, fanaticism and hypocrisy, produced in Clement and an Athenase, a Chrysostum and an Augustine; absorbed into the sphere of Christianity all which was most valuable in the philosophies of Greece and Egypt, and in the social organization of Rome, as an heirloom for nations yet unborn; and laid in foreign lands by unconscious agents, the foundations of all European thought and Ethics." And furthermore: "But some great Providence forbade to our race, triumphant in every other quarter, a footing beyond the Mediteranean, or even in Constantinople, which to this day preserves in Europe the fatih and manners of Asia. The Eastern world seemed barred by some stern doom, from the only influence that could have regenerated it." These words, written sixty years ago are no longer true. Almost the whole of Asia appears to be on the verge of an era of regeneration. What the next score of years shall bring forth no human being can foretell. It makes one shudder to think of the anguish, the awful waste of life and treasure caused by the misrule of these terrible centuries. It seems to me men have been rational—and therefore the course of events also—in the exact ratio to their freedom and intelligence. Conduct can be neither rational nor ethical unless it be free. "The kingdom of God is within you." This kingdom is a force, an agency prompting to righteousness, but only prompting, never compelling. We have no right to say that some men are rational and others are not; nor that some men are intrinsically more rational at one period of history than at another. But we are justified in saying that all men are at times more influenced by rational motives than at others. As the ages pass, the accumulated experience prompts more men to act in accordance with reason. Prejudice, impulse, passion, and other

disturbances of the psyche often obscure the reason or eclipse it entirely. Where knowledge is limited people are more under the sway of passion than where there is a larger sum of knowledge and deeper insight. Isaiah tells his people that the Lord desires to reason with them; that if they wish to be prosperous and happy they must do what is right. This is still sound doctrine; *it is just as true as ever, although it does not seem to hold good with everybody, for reasons which are hard to explain. Some men appear to be the favorites of fortune while others equally deserving have tribulation. The Psalmist was puzzled with this problem. But there have always been men, just as there are at this day, who felt that they must obey the divine monitor cost what it might. "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel," to some men means, woe is me if I fail or refuse to follow the course which I believe to be right. The still, small voice does not prompt all men to act in the same way, nor is it equally imperious with all men; but that there has ever been a man who had no promptings is very doubtful. The great majority of mankind have an erroneous view of the purpose of life. They inconsiderately assume that "being's end and aim" is happiness. But it is not. There is a profound philosophical and ethical truth in the words of the poet:*

"Not enjoyment and not sorrow
Is our destined end and way."

Christ said: "I came not to bring peace, but a sword." This is a figurative expression for the strife between good and evil, a strife that never ends. "There is no discharge in this war." Hegel says: "The history of the world is not the theatre of happiness. Periods of happiness are blank pages in it, for they are periods of harmony—periods when the antithesis is in abeyance." It can not be said of a man who turns his back upon all he once held dear and upon all who hold him dear that he does so in pursuit of happiness. There is a feeling of satisfaction in the consciousness of doing one's duty, let it cost what it may, but this feeling can hardly be called happiness. This incessant strife is becoming less vindictive, less sanguinary, less heartless as the days go by but it is still a strife. "Corrupt but contented," de-

scribes the conditions where the moral forces in an individual or in a community are dormant. When Paul wrote to Timothy: "I have fought a good fight," he did not add, I have had a good time, or I have enjoyed myself, or I have been happy. Such thoughts were evidently not in his mind, but that his end was peaceful no one doubts. Emotions, especially the appetencies, play a large part in the world's drama, often for the good of men; yet that they should be kept in subordination to the reason and the will needs no argument. I can not more fitly close this article than by a brief personal reference. A short time ago a man died whom I had known intimately for twenty-five years. During his life he said more than once that he wanted to have inscribed upon his tombstone, "He had a good time." This man was what is often called a good fellow. He never showed any malice toward anyone or harbored a grudge. On the other hand he never, of his free will took a firm stand for anything. He always wanted to be with the majority. If he happened to make a statement, or asserted anything, that seemed likely to get him into an unpleasant position, as he thought, he never hesitated to retract, even to telling a point-blank lie. He was one of those men who have no influence whatever, because nobody had any confidence in him. Now that he is gone nobody feels a loss. Nobody cared enough for him to be his enemy; no one trusted him far enough to be his steadfast friend.

Athens, Ohio.

ARTICLE V.

INTERMARRIAGE OF BELIEVERS AND UNBELIEVERS

BY REV. A. E. DEITZ.

The Scriptures teach that marriage is of God. The narrative of its institution is found in the second chapter of Genesis. In this narrative it is said (verse 18), "And Jehovah God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him." According to this fundamental statement, one of the great principles underlying the institution of marriage is that of helpfulness, mutual helpfulness. The husband is to be a help to the wife and the wife a help to the husband. They are to be a mutual comfort and support to each other.

This helpfulness extends to spiritual things as well as temporal. Husband and wife are to help each other morally and religiously. There can be no question as to the reality and power of their reciprocal influence, either for good or for evil. The true husband is a spiritual aid to his wife. His influence, for example, may add strength and firmness to her faith and character. And the true wife is a spiritual aid to her husband. Her influence may add sweetness and gentleness and kindness to his character.

Unfortunately this primary principle of mutual helpfulness is lost sight of by many in our day. Too often a man or a woman enters into the marriage relation with one who can not possibly be a help morally and religiously but who is rather a perpetual hindrance in spiritual things. This finds frequent illustration in the intermarriage of believers with unbelievers. In the very nature of the case such a marriage contradicts the fundamental idea of the divine institution as set forth in Genesis. It is no wonder then that St. Paul lays down the principle in 1 Cor. 7:39, that Christians should enter the marriage relation, "Only in the Lord,"—a limitation of choice which is included as well in the more general injunction of 2 Cor. 6:14, "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers."

It is hard to overestimate the danger to the Christian which

is involved in such a marriage. We have read the Old Testament with blinded eyes if we have not seen this lesson there. The greatest evils and calamities of which its pages speak are traced back to this one source, the intermarriage of the children of God with the children of the world. This was the fruitful source of that abounding wickedness which preceded and made necessary the flood in Noah's day. The story of the flood begins with the statement, "And it came to pass when men began to multiply on the face of the ground and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God (i. e. probably the descendants of Shem) saw the daughters of men (probably the descendants of Cain) that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they choose." Gen. 6:1, 2. Up to this time the two lines of descent seem to have been kept distinct but now the children of God began to intermarry with the children of the world and the result was such a corruption of their own morals as to leave the world with but one righteous family in it and to call down the divine judgment upon an ungodly race. The marriage of Lot's daughters to men in Sodom furnishes another melancholy lesson.

And when the children of Israel were brought into the land of Canaan, for their own moral and religious protection, the command was given with reference to the inhabitants of the land, "Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son; for he will turn away thy son from following me that they may serve other gods." Deut. 7:3, 4. It was precisely the violation of this rule by King Solomon (see 1 Kings, 11) that led to the turning away of his own heart from the Lord and the setting up of idols in the city of Jerusalem. Here was the beginning of the downfall of the Jewish nation which up to this time under David and at first under Solomon, had made such splendid and glorious progress. Its doom was sealed in the hour when Solomon took to himself wives from among the heathen. Mention might also be made of Ahab and of others among the later kings whose idolatry and wickedness are directly ascribed to the influence of their non-Jewish wives. Clearly these unlawful marriages were disastrous in their influ-

ence and contributed largely to the growth of evil among the people and to the final overthrow of the entire nation.

The warning thus set forth meets us again in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah dealing with the return from captivity and the events immediately following. See Ezra 9 and 10 and Neh. 13:23-28. And so the Old Testament history from beginning to end bears remarkable and unmistakable testimony to the necessity of separation from the world and to the danger and spiritual loss which are involved in the intermarriage of believers with unbelievers.

The world about us to-day may be more civilized and refined than that which surrounded the ancient Jew, its idolatry may be spiritual and not literal, but at heart it is quite as far away from God and quite as hostile to Him as ever and all entangling alliances therewith are to be avoided.

The danger involved is strikingly set forth by Dr. Marcus Dods in his commentary on Genesis VI (see *The Expositor's Bible*), when he says, "The Mosaic law was stringent against intermarriage with idolatresses and still in the New Testament something more than an echo of the old denunciation of such marriages is heard. Those who were most concerned about preserving a pure morality and a high tone in society were keenly alive to the dangers that threatened from this quarter. It is a permanent danger to character because it is to a permanent element in human nature that the temptation appeals. To many in every generation, perhaps to the majority, this is the most dangerous form in which worldliness presents itself; and to resist this the most painful test of principle. With natures keenly sensitive to beauty and superficial attractiveness, some are called upon to make their choice between a conscientious cleaving to God and an attachment to that which in the form is perfect but at heart is defective, depraved, godless. Where there is great outward attraction a man fights against a growing sense of inward uncongeniality, and persuades himself he is too scrupulous and uncharitable, or that he is a bad reader of character. There may be an undercurrent of warning; he may be sensible that his whole nature is not satisfied and it may seem to him ominous that what is best within him does not flourish in his new attachment, but rather what is inferior, if not what is worst.

But all such omens and warnings are disregarded and stifled by some such silly thought as that consideration and calculation are out of place in such matters. And what is the result? The result is the same as it ever was. Instead of the ungodly rising to the level of the godly, he sinks to hers. The worldly style, the amusements, the fashions once distasteful to him but allowed for her sake, become familiar, and at last wholly displace the old and godly ways, the arrangements that left room for acknowledging God in the family; and there is one household less as a point of resistance to the incursion of an ungodly tone in society, one deserter more added to the already too-crowded ranks of the ungodly, and the lifetime if not the eternity of one soul embittered."

The frequency with which these unscriptural marriages are contracted makes the subject worthy of attention and shows how great and wide-spread is the danger involved. When, for example (and we take a real, not a supposed case) one-third of all the married women belonging to a congregation have unbelieving husbands, what a loss of influence and power there is to that Church! The family life in one home out of every three in such a congregation is in the nature of the case far below the ideal which a Christian family ought to maintain. Perhaps after all the strong words of Dr. G. Campbell Morgan are none too strong when he asserts that, "Half the present condition of worldliness in the Church comes from the breaking of that commandment, (Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers. 2 Cor. 6:14), among those who have been born again." In the same connection he says, "It would be a blessed thing if that little sentence were engraved in letters of gold and kept perpetually before the eyes of all Christian people. The marriage relationship is to be entered into only between those who are Christians. That marriage is contrary to the purpose of God and that marriage is contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ which consists in the union of a believer with an unbeliever." See Northfield Echoes, Vol. 7, No. 4, page 443.

Godly people everywhere complain of the spirit of worldliness which prevails in the land to-day and even creeps into the Church and destroys its activity and power. But we are slow to trace this spirit of worldliness back to the conditions which

foster and nourish it. A little observation and study of the present state of affairs would perhaps reveal how much of truth there is in the statement of Dr. Dods already quoted that, "the most dangerous form in which worldliness presents itself" is in the temptation of a Christian to marry a non-Christian, and also in the statement of Dr. Morgan that such marriages are responsible for "half of the worldliness in the Church to-day."

It is in part the fault of the Church itself that Christian people so frequently enter into the marriage relation contrary to the Scriptural rule. The subject is not often discussed in the pulpit. The scriptural teaching is rarely presented to men. Many people have never heard a single word on this topic from the pulpit and are surprised when their attention is called to the teaching of the Bible. Here and there some pastor like Dr. Morgan to whom we have referred or the late Dr. M. Valentine of our own Church (See the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for April 1893, page 250) calls attention to the matter. But what is needed is a wider discussion of the Scriptural principles underlying the institution of marriage. The warning voice needs to be lifted up everywhere against the union of the believing and the unbelieving in marriage and the perils of such a course need to be made clear to all.

More than this the Church might do. She might refuse to sanction such marriages and instruct her pastors not to officiate in such cases. This may seem extreme. But the Scriptures themselves forbid these marriages. The peril to souls is great as a result of them and the Church itself is weakened thereby. A Church rule corresponding to the Scriptural rule in regard to such cases would at least save some from danger and spiritual loss and would eventually give us more really Christian homes and a stronger Church and a better world.

Ponca, Neb.

ARTICLE VI.

ORIGINAL SIN.*

BY REV. SANFORD N. CARPENTER.

"They likewise teach that, after the fall of Adam all men born according to nature, are born in sin, that is without the fear of God, without confidence toward God and with concupiscence and that this disease (*morbus*) or fault of origin (*vitium originis*) is truly sin condemning now and bringing eternal death to those who are not born again through (*per*) baptism and the Holy Spirit. They condemn the Pelagians and others who deny that the fault of origin is sin and that they may lessen (*extenuent*) the glory of the merits and benefits of Christ, argue that a man may be just *before God by the power of his own reason.*" (*Literal Translation of Latin of Form. Con. from Ed. Prin. of Melancthon.*)

Such is the text of Augsburg Confession, Art. 2, which may be said to be, on the manward side (anthropologically) the very touch stone of true Lutheranism. Since the days of the Reformation it has been the Shibboleth of our Church as touching the nature of sin and the state of man. Upon the acceptance or rejection of this article not *quatenus* but *ex animo* depends the orthodoxy of any Lutheran teacher or preacher. He may, by a qualified (*quatenus*) acceptance of the same, rejecting parts thereof, maintain the outward shell of Lutheranism, but being a Lutheran in name will not make him one in fact. One might broaden this statement to say that this article concerning original sin is the rock upon which orthodox Christianity and rationalism split. He who rejects original sin as taught in holy scripture may perform all sorts of intellectual and doctrinal gymnastic feats, but seldom will he stand squarely on his feet. Rejection of this doctrine is the entering wedge of the vascillation, equivocation, uncertainty and doubt of the double-minded man

* Paper read before the Conference of Lutheran Ministers of Pittsburg and vicinity on December 14, 1908, by Rev. Sanford N. Carpenter. Published by request of the Association.

on all questions of law, philosophy and religion. Realizing the great importance of this article, your writer does not presume to give anything new nor yet to speak with the dogmatism of the last word on this subject. Enough will remain to be said after we are through to fill several large-sized volumes. We will endeavor as faithfully as we know how, to present the teachings of our Church on this subject with the preface that, as for ourselves, we firmly and *ex animo* believe what the Lutheran Church teaches.

Let us for sake of clearness divide this subject after the style of the Article itself: treating (1) of the nature and extent of original sin: (2) of its effects and consequences: (3) of the only remedy for original sin: (4) of the relation of this article with respect to other teachings and systems.

I.

As to its nature:—"Since the fall of Adam" is evidently an interpretation of Rom. 5:12: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin. And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," which teaches us that original sin is something which we have by inheritance from our first parents. This has passed upon all men by virtue of imputation which means that in the first sin Adam was a representative of all our race and that the race at such time was potentially in Adam, as the oak is in the acorn. Though this phase is a comparatively new development of the doctrine of original sin. The word impute is better described by the German "*zurechnen*." The authority for this doctrine is gathered from such passages as Rom. 5:14, 19, "Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" and, "for as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners."

But the theologians of our Church lay chief emphasis upon the Scripture teaching that sin is an inheritance through natural generation. The poison of sin entered the stream of humanity at its fountain head and polluted all its waters down through the long course of the ages of the world's history. As says Holazius: "Our first parents are the proximate cause of this

original blemish from whose impure blood the stain has flowed into our hearts. No black crow ever produces a white dove; nor ferocious lion a gentle lamb; and no man polluted with original sin ever begets a holy child." This sounds like the very echo of Job 14:4: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not *one*." Gerhardt says: "Therefore that sin (of Adam) is not in all respects foreign to us because Adam did not sin as a private man, but as the head of the whole human race; and as human nature was communicated through him, so also natural corruption was similarly propagated." In Gen. 5:3 we read that "Adam lived an hundred and thirty years and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image." The "image" here mentioned is as much mind and soul as flesh and blood. Adam propagated or begat a son in his own likeness, like himself stained with sin, after his image, fearfully marred by sin in the soul. So in the familiar passage Ps. 51:5, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me."

We have not the time to multiply familiar proofs, but pass on to note that, as being deep as human nature itself, original sin is described as an indwelling sin—something that is present to live within us—within our nature but not of its substance as Flaccius erroneously taught. The German describes the fact of indwelling sin by the very suggestive word "*einshtecken*," a thing which sticks in human nature, an intruder yet a part of the story of life itself. In Rom. 7 this original sin or fault is called "sin" no less than fourteen times. As to indwelling, witness Rom. 7:17, "Now then it is no more I that do it but sin that dwelleth (*ἐνοικοῦσα*) in me." The same chapter, verse 21, calls it, "a law in my members, an evil lying near (*κακὸν παράκειται*). Heb. 12:1 describes it as "the sin which does so easily beset us (*ἐνπαρίστατον*)."

From these scripture texts we have the authority in the article for calling original sin a disease, German (*senche*), Latin (*morbis*) or sickness. It is the *morbis* of the Latin which describes disease as a baneful power working a secret destruction within the members, a sickness caused by the multiplication of germs and microbes which will yield only to the most powerful medicines. The other word is "*erb-sunde*" inherited sin, Latin "*vitium*" (*fault of origin*) which describes sin more in its outward

manifestation, as a horrible mutilation, a running sore, or cancerous growth which will yield only to the knife of the surgeon. The "vitium" or fault is best described in Is. 1:6, "From the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in it but wounds, and bruises and putrifying sores."

This leads us on to the thought concerning the nature of sin that it is truly a sin of nature, that is, a *state* or condition of sin. As long as original sin dwells in the members, man is in a state of *sin-full-ness*. It is out of this state or condition that that which we call actual sin (a distinction in name only) grows. It is inborn or original sin which makes a man what he is—a sinful being. The so-called actual sin is what he does. It is the actual sin which man sees. The state of sin is seen by the Lord also, "For man looketh on the outward appearance but God looketh on the heart." Of this state Jesus says: John 3:6, "That which is born of flesh is flesh," for as flesh it is subject not only to the limitations of the flesh but of the sinful nature and state as well. So that "ye must be born again" into a new state or condition. Jer. 17:9 describes this state thus: "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked: who can know it?" This sin of origin is deep as the very springs of nature even in the thoughts and intents and purposes, which govern the trend of life, even the heart deep—deep in the inmost state and condition. It is pre-eminently a *state* of *sin-full-ness*.

This state appears all the more degraded when contrasted with the original heights from which man fell. For was it not the very image and likeness of God in which he was created? for "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." Gen. 1:27. This image was nothing less than a glorious state of clear knowledge, righteousness and true holiness as proven by Eph. 4:24, "And that ye put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Col. 3:10, "And (ye) have put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him," Ecc. 7:29, "Lo, this only have I found that God hath made man upright." From such glorious, ineffable heights has man fallen, to what depths we shall see directly. The hope of the ages, that which sets the true value on human nature is the promise of

grace that man may be restored to the fulness of that divine image.

As to the extent of the ruin of original sin, the Confession speaks in a few clauses; "since the fall of Adam all men who are naturally engendered." This taint of original sin is as wide as the human race. A reference to holy scripture will show how firmly this doctrine is based upon the Divine Word. The universality of sin is a fact which the scripture puts in very clear and succinct language. Witness Paul in Eph. 2:3, "And we (Christians) were by nature the children of wrath even as others." Rom. 3:10, 12, 23. "There is none righteous, no not one," and, "They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable: there is none that doeth good, no not one," and, "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." That original sin is not a N: T. doctrine only, witness many such passages as Ps. 14:1, 2, 3. "They are corrupt, they have done abominable works. There is none that doeth good. The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy. There is none that doeth good, no not one." How like the tolling of the clock of doom is the sad repetition: "There is none that doeth good." How this scripture teaching of the immorality of original sin puts to shame the Romish figment of the holy and immaculate Mary!

II.

Having briefly brought to the bar of reason a few of the great cloud of witnesses as to the nature and extent of original sin, let us look into its ruinous effects and consequences. The first two mentioned in the Confession are privitive. There are wanting, as a result of original sin, certain powers; for man is "without fear of God and without trust in God." Without fear of God because as Rom. 8:7, "The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed, can be." "So then they that are in the flesh (regardless of age or circumstances) cannot please God." Rather than that the subject of original sin could have true fear or trust in God is the

soul as our Confession declares born "with concupiscence," that is from the mother's womb, full of evil desire and inclination. "For I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me." Rom. 7:21.

Our Confession here lays emphasis upon the fact that this *vitium*, or *erb sunde* is truly sin. Pelagians and rationalists in general, on the contrary, maintain that this sin is only a *defect* of our nature to be remedied by a development. By this Pelagian definition sin is only like a shortness in stature, which defect may be eliminated by mental, moral and spiritual growth of a more or less extended period of time. Our Confession and our Church, on the other hand, maintain against this enthroning of human reason and belittling of the sinfulness, fault or "*culpa*" of sin that it is truly sin: the very sin which condemns and brings eternal death.

Dr. Krauth, quoting Quenstedt, in "The Conservative Reformation," mentions three ways in which sin is wrought. (1) When person corrupts nature—as done by Adam and Eve; (2) When nature corrupts person as in the case of original sin; (3) When person corrupts person—as in actual sins. According to this doctrine of sin we have a view of fallen man, not as he once was possessing the image and likeness of the holy God, the highest expression of God's thought on earth, but as he now is with that image fearfully marred. Like the ruin of an ancient temple once dazzling in whiteness and resplendent with inscriptions of eternal truth which shine forth as the sun, now cracked, seared, fallen, still bearing the marred image or inscription of truth, but with that image overshadowed and covered by vines and mosses or lying prone in the dust covered with forbidding rubbish, capable of being raised and restored to its originality in the cosmic beauty of the universe—so is man. Human nature has been compared to a block of marble capable of a marvelous transformation. Under the mighty blows of the hammer of eternal truth, by the grace of God, that block may be transformed into an angel, or under the adverse and damnable influences of sin that material may, by falling still farther from grace, be transformed into a devil.

The fact that this inborn sin deprives of the true fear of God and trust in him, bringing also this fulness of evil desire and in-

clination and consequent blight and ruin of conscience, intellect and will, leads on to the natural conclusion that they who have the light shut out by concupiscence cannot by nature return to the light. He who totally lacks fear of God and trust in him cannot find his way back to God. "For the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them for they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. 2:14. Again, (1 Cor. 4:7) "What hast thou that thou didst not receive." So ruined is human nature by sin, that of its own strength it could not raise a little finger toward heaven, think a good thought, nor perform a good act, for, with infinite sweep of thought the Lord Jesus declares concerning the sinful nature, "*A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit.*" There is no lonely spot in all the universe of God where a soul, unaided by divine grace, might go and after a process of untold ages, call itself clean, for the "thought and imagination being only evil continually," it could only become worse and worse. To illustrate further:—Were such a thing possible, one might soar through space at the unremitting express pace of 60 miles per hour for 177 years and finally arrive at the sun, but be no nearer a sunbeam than had he remained in his place on earth. So at the end of all human endeavor the soul, no matter how great its toils, intellectual, moral and spiritual, would be no nearer divine grace than at the outset. Man is a creature governed far more by his state of heart than circumstances and as long as original sin is allowed to remain, poets and philosophers may dream of and philanthropists may sacrifice their means for an ideal community, but they will never have it. Take a sinful man out of the mire of sin and if the sinful nature remains, he will return to it again and again. This is only another way of saying that social and moral reform can be made permanent only through the regeneration of the individual. Luther in his *Kirchen Postil* likens fallen man to a stone, a block of wood, or a clod as far as operating or co-operating in his own regeneration and conversion is concerned, without the grace of the Holy Spirit.

The final consequence of original sin is eternal death: "Now bringing eternal death to those who are not born again." This is the "reatus" or liability which follows upon the "culpa" or

guilt of original sin. Eternal death may seem an extreme penalty for an infant which suffers sin as its misfortune rather than through any act of its own choice. But we remember that, "the wages of sin is death," a penalty which did not stop even at Jesus Christ, the only begotten son of God when he assumed its liability. The innocence of the child is, after all, only a relative innocence; true its feet have never trodden in the paths of sin, its hand has not turned against God or his workmanship, its eyes have not gazed with lust, nor has it lifted up its own soul unto vanity, nor "sworn deceitfully" in denying his Maker, but nevertheless, it is burdened with that which cannot enter heaven over the portals of which is written "Nothing that loveth or maketh a lie can enter here." Being cursed with a carnal mind, it is liable to the fate of that carnal mind, "for to be carnally-minded is death." This picture is indeed very dark and small wonder that weak faith often shrinks from it. Like the wounded man who objects and shrinks from the probe, so many would gloss over this sin and make it nothing. Not heeding the fact that thereby they cast reproach upon the suffering and merit of Christ. In minimizing the effect of sin, men do away with the need of a Saviour even as he who refuses to believe himself sick, has no need of the physician, as Christ declares, "They that are whole (or like the Pharisees think themselves whole) have no need of the physician."

III.

This brings us to the discussion of the *Remedy for Original Sin*, which is to be born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit. Thank God he has shown us the exceeding sinfulness of sin in order that we may have an appreciation of the remedy. "The wages of sin" are shown to be death, that we may know that "the gift of God" is "eternal life." The same remedy is here made to avail for original sin as for any other for "There is no other name under heaven, given among men whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12.

All flesh who would be saved must be born again. "Except a man (mankind) be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Accepting the doctrine of original sin, there is abso-

lutely no escape from a firm faith in baptismal regeneration.* Even Dean Alford in his interpretation of John 3:5 and 6 agrees with the Lutheran Church on this point. "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord" and how can one be holy unless God who alone "worketh the willing and the doing" in child or old man, of his own will begets the soul afflicted with original sin that it should be one of the first fruits of his creation. "For it is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do for his own good pleasure." Dr. Krauth says of even an adult human being that "the power of such a person in the matter of his regeneration is *absolutely* negative. He can resist, he can thwart, he can harden himself, but in and of himself he cannot yield or consent or make his heart tender." This agrees with the Word which declares, Rom. 3:24, "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," where grace qualified only by the Word *freely* is made absolute. So also Eph. 2:8, "For by grace are ye saved through faith and that (faith) not of yourselves; (it is) the gift of God." How should it be thought a thing impossible that the infinite power of the Holy Spirit which can break and melt the stony heart of an adult hardened in sin, could not—yea would not touch and tender the heart of a little child? With God all things are possible. By boldly accepting the doctrine of original sin the adult, recognizing that his own good and perfect gift of salvation is from above, may quite readily comprehend that the same grace which controls and guides his prejudiced understanding can reach a little lower (or higher) and guide and control the pure and unprejudiced reason of the child. He will not take offense at the fact that, by the grace of God, "we have this treasure in earthen vessels" (weak preachers and earthly elements such as water in baptism) that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us." 2 Cor. 4:7.

We see then that the cross whose redeeming merit is applied in baptism is not only an expression of the lowliness of man's fall but also of his untold value, for "ye are bought with a price." Baptismal regeneration is the doctrine which makes of

* The Lutheran Church does not teach that unbaptized infants are lost but claims that while God has limited us to the means of grace (baptism) he does not limit himself and *may* accomplish the change of heart without means.

the child an organism, a life, a reasonable being, something with a heart that must be changed. The Reformed figment of Baptism is that a being is acceptable to God which does not of itself accept God. Baptism, in the Lutheran Church, means that the reconciliation extends both ways; God accepts the child and the child is, by grace, led to accept God.

It is the very fact that men have assumed too great a share of regeneration on their own part, that makes this doctrine of child salvation difficult. But Christ says:—"Except *ye* become as little children *ye* cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." In this matter the Lutheran Church declares with St. Paul, "When I am weak then I am strong."

IV.

This leads us to the last division which is the relation of this doctrine to other teachings and systems. The Confession declares:—"They condemn the Pelagians and others who deny that this fault of origin is sin and that they may lessen the glory of the suffering and merit of Christ, argue that a man may be just before God by the power of his own reason."

This clause taken in its true sense rebukes all species of Pelagianism—Semi—Demi—Quasi—or Crypto Pelagianism in whatever form a rationalizing skepticism may present it. Pelagianism virtually denies sin of nature and limits it to act: This is a placing of the species for the genus; the branch for the tree. If Pelagian teaching concerning the primitive purity of man be suffered to enter, it opens the flood-gates to a vast stream of impure doctrine concerning the natural powers of man. It is, in some form or other, responsible for every phase of rationalism from those who interpret the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper to suit themselves to those who weigh the counsels of the Infinite in the puny balance of the human mind and attempt to reduce the infinite and transcendent God to a force to be comprehended and measured by science and immanent only in the stone which man raises or the clod which he turns. For the natural fruit of Pelagianism when driven to its logical conclusion is rationalism, that which the Lord in such passages as Rom. 11:33-34, challenges:—"Oh the depth of the riches both

of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?" Our doctrine of original sin teaches us so to be truly humble that "casting down imagination and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, (we may) bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10:5. This article raises the bar high and turns the bolt firm and secure against the intrusion of each and every form of rationalism under the sun and leads us ever, in every time of doubt or darkness to the analogy of faith; that we may see the sun by its own light rather than by the tallow dips of ancient or modern science—in other words—let the holy Scripture speak for and interpret itself.

If the science of ethnology and anthropology have a question to ask of the Lutheran Church they will find an answer here. For plainly, the Lutheran Church must logically believe in the doctrine of Traducianism, that is, that the soul of the child is propagated along with the body by the parents. "For he hath made of one (*εξ-ἑνος*) all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Traducianism is the *media via* between the doctrine of Creationism on the one hand, and Pre-existence of souls on the other hand. With respect to the former (Creationism) it is hard to see how it can logically escape making God the author of sin; with respect to the latter (Pre-existence, which was the doctrine of Plato) it is hard to see how it can escape the most baneful consequences of the doctrine of metempsychosis or transmigration of souls, the curse of India and China. The Lutheran doctrine of original sin with its teaching of inherited fault lands our church squarely in the lap of the safer and saner philosophy of Traducianism. We have made bold to treat this doctrine as a result or outgrowth of our doctrine of original sin, while Dr. Krauth makes it a pre-supposition. But Traducianism, like any point in a circle, may be both the beginning or the end of the thought.

The doctrine of original sin as taught in this article holds an important place in the discussion of the theory of Evolution. It does not try to disentangle the difficulties of the theory but cuts the knot squarely in two. Perhaps, after another half century

of vain endeavor to open the knot, science and the rest of the Christian world may awake to a realization that the Lutheran Church is right. In the light of this article there is no room for such doctrine as the spiritual and moral upward evolution of man *independent of Divine Grace*.

Clothed in its latest and most attractive garb which men call Theistic Evolution this theory is little more than a thinly veiled imitation of the exploded Darwinianism. A glance at the writings of its advocates with their oft re-iterated apologies for the fallen champion of their faith will convince the most skeptical that this is a fact. Darwinism sought a solution for the problem of the *origin* of species independent of an infinite, transcendent, personal God: the new Evolution seeks for a solution of the problem of *development* of species practically independent of an infinite, transcendent and personal God. In their mad effort to avoid anything looking like an external, transcendent Providence, they have apotheosized or made a God of an immanent, impersonal force and the strenuous appeals of the High Priests of this cult who have set up this golden calf in their efforts to convince their disciples that these be the gods that have led them out of the Egypt of ignorance and superstition would be amusing if the result were not so tragic. 'Tis sad indeed to see how men because they see an element of unity binding organic nature together and, in turn, binding it to the universe of being, have tried to force the whole universe into an unnatural union. It reminds one very much of the abortive attempts of certain ecclesiastics to force together contradictory elements in a union of churches.

Now, although by reason of sin, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now," the Lutheran Church does not deny the possibility of an evolution in nature under the directive Providence of God; she does emphatically deny the possibility of an upward development in moral and spiritual things, without the *praevenient* grace of God. But under grace, she asserts the possibility of a development, for the human soul, beyond the wildest dream of Science. Men may keep on arguing until the judgment day, but the evidence of such volumes of brick and stone like jails, asylums, and living witnesses like armies of police trained to keep human nature

in subjection; the long lists of crime, the growing statistics of every city show that the preponderance of evidence is in our favor. Besides, such retrogression as the heathen world has always shown made eloquent by the voiceless ruins of Nineveh, Carthage, Babylon, Ancient Athens, and the land of the Sphinx still assert that we are right. Without the grace of God, man, cursed with the fault and disease of sin may develop but that development even though witnessed by external splendor will, owing to its internal death and rottenness be ever, ever downward. We trust that, ere long, Science herself may awake to believe that the patient Agazziz, the dogmatic Cuvier and the Augsburg Confession are right in asserting that man can rise to his true divinely intended glory and power only by the grace of the transcendent, personal God, who also "worketh *in and through* all things."

Philosophically, this doctrine asserts a plurality of substance over against the abstract monism of Budha, Hegel, Leibnitz and others. Astouching the validity of human knowledge with respect to the problem of nominalism, the second article classes the Lutheran Church with those who believe a moderate realism with its assertion "universalia in re." The Lutheran Church with her doctrine of inherited sin stands on ground mediating between Aristotelian realism and Platonic idealism neither making sin of the substance of nature nor reducing it to a hypostatized "idea."

I have alluded to these speculative sciences, not because our Church teaches philosophy, but to illustrate the safe and mediating tendency of any Church which clings to the Eternal Word of God. For, with our Church the Word is first, last and every-time. Her fidelity to that Word is, at the same time, her reproach in the world and her pride and glory among the people of God. For well does the Church know that, though the sun may yet mark on the dial plate of the universe many aeons of time, that word will stand through the untold ages.

The present powers of the world may, indeed raise their political, literary, scientific and commercial achievements to most prodigious heights; these in time, may crumble and with Memphis, Carthage and Babylon lie long beneath the accumulated dust of ages. The very names, France, England, Germany,

America, may, like them, become mere blots on the pages of history, but the truths concerning original sin and redemption as taught from God's Word by his Church will survive the withering touch of time and live on to eternity for *thus saith the Lord*: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

Pittsburg, Pa.

ARTICLE VII.

THE JOYS OF THE MINISTRY.*

BY REV. CHARLES R. TROWBRIDGE.

Any work that lacks the element of joy lacks that which is of the greatest value to the worker. What men accomplish for themselves or for others may be successful, but if their work is a joyless task it is in so far a failure. The thing worth while has been missed. Men are toiling unceasingly in all departments of effort, seeking a portion of pleasure in their search for profit, but too often finding the profit without the pleasure, and not realizing what or how much they are actually losing. A task, easy or difficult, brings satisfaction of the right sort only when something of joy mingles with the necessary effort, and brings a sweet content and peace that are full of lasting blessing. Men may work with grimly persistent faithfulness, and in the midst of surroundings and under circumstances that are unpleasant and uncomfortable, accomplishing their work well. What a joyless sort of labor it is, with few compensations, few attractions!

There is no work in all the world so productive of permanent joy, so abundant in its opportunities for lasting happiness, so sure to return a substantial reward for the efforts put forth, as the work of the ministry. In all the world there is no nobler work. Every one who enters it realizes that, to some extent, at least. As some one has beautifully said: "It is the noblest calling that can enlist to itself the enthusiasm, the devotion, the service and the sacrifice of a human being. It is no beggar at the door of the world. It is no ragged sentimentalist, thrumming a harp for smiles and pennies. It is no uncredentialed wayfarer, soliciting alms from a charitable and generous public. It is no prison of the soul, shadowed by a various assortment of glooms, chilled by a long procession of frosts, and dampened by drippings from moldy walls. It is *king* of the professions. It is more than a profession; it is a confession, it is a witness-bearer. It works at the springs of character, and hammers at the foundations of life. It is former and reformer. It deals

* Address delivered at Gettysburg, Pa., before Alumni of the Theological Seminary.

with evolution and revolution. It grasps humanity round all its circumference and toils upward with it towards heaven. It stands in the waste places, in the jungles, on the far frontiers, in the slums of the world, in the black belts of barbarism, among the fire-fringed threats of a thousand anarchies, among the pains and tortures and pangs that roll up from the nethermost pits of hell. It is found at the joyous feasts of life, companion to its innocent pleasures, sharer in its glad hallelujahs, lover of men, and, like its divine Master, lover of nature, friend to the sun and the wind, the meadow sprinkled with flowers, the wayside, the hillside, the roadside, hearing a divine undertone beneath the symphonies of the forest, finding the material world crammed with revelation, every bush of it alight with celestial light, and the whole universe a sounding board against which God's voice is heard continually thundering." (McKittrick).

All of us have undoubtedly felt something of the thrill and uplift of the lofty ideas that the ministry inspires in those who undertake the work it demands; but possibly with the passage of years, the routine of daily work, the increasing pastoral efforts, so unceasing and often so exhausting, the constant pulpit preparation from week to week, the thousand and one calls that the active pastor, in every community, must hear and answer, these have dulled the keen pleasure that once was ours, have dimmed the joy we once felt. It will be a matter for sincere thankfulness if any word uttered on this occasion will serve to recall, however faintly, some reason for joy in *our* ministry, that may inspire us to greater effort and more earnest faithfulness in the Master's service. Briefly, then, let me indicate some of the causes that are productive of real joy in our ministry.

The *first one is, a consciousness of the divine direction in our work.* The disciples of the Lord had the distinct direction of the Master when he said to them, "*Behold, I send you forth.*" Their commission came from him, the directions for their labor emanated from Christ. No disciple of the Lord Jesus since that early day has lacked a similar support. No minister of Christ, truly set apart to his work, need lack the feeling that his mission is of divine origin. The thought must bring joy with it, for he who works for and with God will surely win out. There is no one whose ministerial experience has not shown examples

of the fact that this consciousness of a higher power governing and ruling has evidently been wanting, and very often. The particular cases have exhibited a weakness, a failure, though evident ability has not been lacking. But there was no heart in the work. What was done was well done, but there was no joy shining through it. Something was wanting to add fullness, roundness, strength, attractiveness to the life. It was due to an absence of the recognition of divine guidance. The peril that attaches to such a condition is by no means small. If the ministry is anything it is a God-given task; it is man speaking for God, and on the authority of God to needy souls; it is the instrument of the divine to bring humanity into closer touch with the saving truth. *"How shall they believe in him whom they have not heard; and how shall they hear without a preacher?"* If this view of the ministry does not obtain, if this high ideal does not present itself, the lower view enters in and obscures the clearness of the vision, blots out the necessary notion of the divine direction, destroys the early enthusiasm, and brings about a total elimination of all sense of joy in the work. A man who, though a minister, gets into such a condition, has one of two courses open to him: either to get out of the labor that has become joyless and distasteful, or, better than that, to make the strongest efforts to get into proper accord once more with a correct idea of his work. No man can afford to get away from the source of divine power. He will become as dead as a trolley car that has lost its touch with the electric current.

A second source of joy in the ministry is the uplifting inspiration of great companionships. The history of the ages is open to us and the most noble characters wait for us to become acquainted with them. Not only is the Bible available as a means of introduction to great men and women of the past, but the wide world of literature presents numberless opportunities to the minister for the acquiring and the increasing of a close and intimate acquaintance with the noble thoughts of noble minds nobly expressed. If much of the world's best literature is a sealed book to multitudes of men, it is nevertheless an open volume to the preacher, and its rich store-houses of mental food and nourishment continually afford new joys and delights to the hungry soul. Here is a source of perpetual satisfaction that no one in the

ranks of the ministry can afford to neglect. Apart from the mental stimulus gained by association with the really great minds of the past and present, there is a joy in intellectual exercise, a pleasure in knowing and understanding the best in human wisdom that are wonderfully inspiring. Knowledge obtained simply for the sake of knowledge degenerates oftentimes into mere pedantry. Knowledge, as a means to better equipment for one's work in behalf of the elevation of human kind, means an added force for the best sort of influence, and as well a greater joy, in the use of that which we have acquired for broadening the vision of men, and giving them a glimpse of the great truths of God. A joy that such effort brings to the true man of God in the pulpit of the Church is like nothing else in the world.

A further source of joy in ministerial life and service is the recognition of the power of sympathetic helpfulness. No man has been in the ministry many months without making discovery of the fact that people *like* to be helped through the expression of an active sympathy. People *expect* to be helped, and as such experiences multiply during the passage of years it becomes a wonderful thing to feel and know that what a minister does and says actually helps men; that our sympathy makes the inevitable burden-bearing in human lives an easier task, makes it a less bitter experience for one here and another there. There are, it may be, lives that are sunnier than ours, but there are very many in which the shadows are deeper, the struggles fiercer, the path steeper and harder. To the minister, as to no one else, comes the opportunity as well as the command for the encouragement of his fellow man. In obeying the distinct call he will find many an unexpected joy that will most abundantly compensate him for any self-denial that may be involved. It is sad to think that there are some who forget this duty of sympathetic helpfulness. Too many in pulpit and pew are given to the utterance of words that dishearten and discourage instead of bracing up the faint-hearted and inspiring the weak. Too many are overly fond of perpetually dwelling on the hardships and discouragements of the conflict. From such there seldom comes a brave, heroic word. On whatever theme they speak the gloomy view predominates. The difficulties always loom up first and largest. This

age in the mind of such, is the most corrupt age of the world. The Church was never so worldly. There never was so much wickedness and so little piety, and so on to the end of the chapter. There is no room nor need in the ranks of the ministry for these men. The gospel we preach is a gospel of hope, and the preaching of it ought to put joy into our hearts and into the hearts of our hearers. The *living* of it ought to add yet greater joy, in that there is no sermon so eloquent as the sermon that is put into practice. To be useful is the highest ideal for any life. No curses in the Bible are so bitter as the curses against uselessness. Uselessness is the worst sort of failure. Usefulness is the measure of all true living. It is the Lord's own test of true discipleship, and it is the aim of the divine helpfulness not to make things easy for us, but to make something *of* us. If we read the story of our Lord's life aright, we find that he was at his best, he was happiest, when he was helping men to do and to be better, in body and soul. He gave himself for men in active uplift. This is possibly the most difficult part of the problem of helpfulness. It is usually easier to give relief than to help a fellow man grow strong. It is easier to answer the appeal of a hungry man for bread for his body than the appeal of a hungry soul for bread for itself. Yet the first is the lesser help; the second is the greater. To no class of men does the opportunity for this greater helpfulness come so often as to us ministers. We may help people best by not carrying the burden for them, but by showing them the source of strength which will enable them to carry the burden for themselves. The best joy will come to us when we can feel that we have in so far carried out the plan which is the divine plan. There is a story of two brothers each of whom wished to do something that should endure as long as time, and be a perpetual monument to his name. One erected with infinite pains and toil, a magnificent obelisk, standing as a gleaming pillar before the gaze of men, amid the sands of the desert. The other, in the same desert, dug a well, and planted about it palm and date trees, to give shade and refreshment to the weary traveler. Which of these two was the wise man?

The final reason that I would mention as one productive of highest joy to every one is that our deepest experiences are widened through self-sacrifice. That word has to most ministers a

very familiar sound—*self-sacrifice*. It is frequently heard from those who give advice to young men about to enter the ministry. It often appears in the columns of our Church papers in connection with admonitions to the clergy to practice this Christian grace in their daily living. It frequently falls from the lips of Church officers in speaking of the necessity for economy in the administration of Church affairs. Sometimes I wonder if it would not be a good thing to suggest that the use of the word be abandoned in its frequent application to the lives of the clergy, and to put it closer to the lives of the laity for their practical use and benefit. No class of men, take it as you will, sacrifice more, or more often than ministers. As some one has truly said, "There was a time within the memory of men still living, when the Christian ministry offered large rewards in a worldly sense. It carried with it a position of honor and of responsibility in society. It opened up avenues of pleasant contact and of wide experience. At a time when learning was confined to a few, the minister was the scholar of the community. In a day when official position was the badge of public respect, the minister shared with the judge and the doctor the social distinctions of office. But these conditions have largely passed away. Other professions compete with the ministry and the prizes they offer seem to many to be greater. Nor is it simply that other professions have grown more attractive. The ministry itself, regarded simply as a profession, seems to have changed for the worse. Considered merely from the economic stand-point, the ministry is one of the few professions in which the scale of compensation has not risen to meet the advancing cost of living, and this in spite of the fact that the demands upon the minister, social and charitable, are constantly increasing. Add to this the increasing uncertainty of tenure, the fierce competition for place, the unreasoning prejudice on the part of many congregations against calling an older man, the prospect at the end of an honorable and faithful life of being forced to depend upon the charity of the Church for the support of one's family, or the education of one's children—all this is a prospect from which high-spirited men naturally and rightly shrink." (Brown). But withall, I am sure that most of us will agree with the position taken, namely, that the joy of sacrifice comes to be more a healthy reality as our

experience deepens and broadens. If there is a sting in it, this is forgotten in the quiet, or it may be the exuberant joy that comes from sacrifice for the Master, or for one's fellowman. The practice of this virtue is not different in the ministerial life from that in any other life. It involves the identical principle and practice, and the results are the same. The trials of the ministry are often spoken of as though they were far apart from those of other people. True, there are peculiar trials that are not common to other men, but while these are often many and heavy, there is a real joy in them that makes them appear light. Any man who looks for a soft job in the Christian ministry will find it about as soft as some of the granite slabs in yonder hills. "But the man who is not looking for a soft job, but for a battlefield where every ounce of his mental and moral equipment shall be trained to the noblest service of humanity; who is willing to endure hardship as a good soldier of Jesus Christ; who is ready to burn like a candle down to the socket in the hand of his Lord; who will not dare to dictate terms to Providence, but will go wherever the bugle calls him; who will roll the sweet and the bitter together and get a divine discipline out of them both; who will stand with an eager eye at the doors of opportunity; who will walk in the ditch if it only brings him nearer the hearts of men and closer to the spirit of God," that man will not only find a plenty of opportunity to exercise his abilities, but will find joy as experience widens and opens new possibilities to him, that will be a foretaste of heaven. No man can find either success or joy in doing good without paying for the experience and paying well. The least we are called to do for men costs something. Even a grain of wheat must fall into the ground and die before the harvest comes. *"He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."* It has been well and truly said, "All along the ages whatever is good and beautiful and worthy has been the fruit of suffering and pain. Civilization has advanced through wars and revolutions and failures, through the ruin, decay and death of empires and kingdoms. What Christian civilization is to-day it is as the harvest of long, sad centuries of weary struggle, toil and oppressions. Earth's thrones of power are built on the wrecks of hopes that have been crushed. Every advance worth

recording has been made through carnage and blood. It seems that without the shedding of blood there is not only no remission of sin, but no progress in life, no growth. Heaven's victorious throngs, wearing white robes and waving branches of palm, come up out of great tribulation. Even Jesus appears in glory as a Lamb that has been slain; his blessedness and his saving power are the fruit of suffering and wounding and death. We know that all the joys and honors of redemption come from the Cross, and that personal holiness can be reached only through struggle, conflict and crucifixion of self. Whatever is good on earth and in heaven is the outcome of pain, sacrifice and death."

Self-sacrifice brings the victory as it deepens and widens our experience. The victory means joy for the victor always, in this spiritual conflict. It is true that many find no joy in self-sacrifice, no satisfaction in the widening of their experiences. Every wave of trial, loss and suffering overwhelms them. They meet trouble as though not conscious of the promise of divine comfort. A novelist describes one in grief as he stands on the shore and gazes at the ship that is bearing away from him the object of his heart's love. In his absolute anguish he does not observe that the tide is rising. It rolls over his feet but he is not conscious of it. Higher and higher the waters rise, now to his knees, now to his loins, now to his breast. But all his thoughts are on the receding ship and he is oblivious to the swelling of the waves and at length they flow over his head and is swept down to death. So comes defeat, because the divine promise is forgotten. The religion in which we believe, the religion which we teach is designed to give complete joy in all our life. "*As sorrowing yet always rejoicing,*" is the scriptural ideal of a Christian life. Joy is not an accident in our experience. It is possible as a perfectly natural thing, as the outcome of whatever may meet us. If sacrifice is our portion we remember that it is by this that the best sort of life is secured and we rejoice to believe that in the great plan we have a place, and that the divine thought is including us within its protection for our development and ultimate happiness. Every experience, though won at the cost of personal sacrifice, in one way and another, magnifies the joy that should possess us, at the thought that all things work together for good to them that love God.

One of the suggestive tendencies of to-day, that has its positive influence on the ministry, is the power of simple honesty, in every phase of its manifestation. That this virtue, so necessary to decent living and proper success and happiness, can oftentimes be secured only through the expenditure of self-denial and sacrifice, is an admitted truism. I believe, as some one has aptly said, that "what the world demands in the twentieth century is not a speculative theology of formulated doctrine about Jesus Christ, but Jesus Christ himself; not simply the historical Christ but the living Christ, spiritually enthroned in the mind and heart of true believers, as the matchless teacher and miraculous personality of our times. The future Church is to be, not a theological laboratory where human prescriptions are labeled with denominational brands and dealt out to the favored few, but vast dispensaries of Christian help and beneficence for the masses, in the spirit and method of the divine Helper who went about doing good." (Newell, *Hom. Rev.* Oct. '06, p. 289). If Jesus Christ was anything of an exponent of true religion he was a simply honest man, who dealt with men in an absolutely honest way. The spirit of greed and graft in its lesser and its greater expressions is rebuked everywhere to-day; and it is the privilege, as it should be the joy, of the Christian minister to imitate his Master in doing good by a life of simple integrity.

Financial honesty, intellectual honesty, especially ecclesiastical honesty must be the mark of every minister's life. If, as some one has well said, "an honest man is the noblest work of God, Satan's ignoblest masterpiece is a dishonest Christian minister. Nothing so undermines the confidence of laymen in their spiritual leader as the slightest indication in him of double-dealing. No sin is more deadly and degrading to a man of God than insincerity. If a man is crotchety he can be tolerated; if he is prejudiced or ignorant he can be borne with; he may be lacking a score of qualities which men count desirable and still be a useful and an honored man. But who can endure a minister who cheats or lies? The gospel preached by such a man falls dead and deadening. Prayer on his lips seems blasphemy. A religious service conducted by him exasperates every heart which doubts him. Deplorable is the condition of a Church which has in its pulpit an anointed rogue." There is scarcely a more de-

spicable figure than a man clad in clerical garb, bearing the name of Christ's messenger, who stands in the pulpit, and for sordid gain, for social position, for prestige of any sort, preaches the doctrine of the Church in which he does not for an instant believe, advocates the tenets of the denomination whose name he bears, while in his secret soul not admitting their truth. A recent writer has said, "when we hire a hall and pay the price we can have any sort of a show the police department will permit, and utter any sentiments to which the auditors will listen without personal violence, but in a Lutheran Church, built with Lutheran money, supported by Lutheran believers, redolent of Lutheran piety, a man should confine himself to doctrines having the sanction of the Lutheran Church. When he has other knick-knacks to offer he should resign from that pulpit, refuse the salary, and then, free as air, give vent to his views beyond the shelter of the consecrated edifice. To proclaim Sabbath after Sabbath doctrines so repugnant to those naturally expected, that a man attracts notice from the public for the first time in his life, to persist until he has scattered a flock he never collected, to take refuge in silence only after dismissal, such a course is most reprehensible," and we may add, wholly dishonest, and destructive of all right influence and prohibitive of all peace and joy both to the congregation and to the minister. No wonder that some men never stay long in any charge, and never find any satisfaction worth while in the employment of the opportunities of the Christian ministry.

Brethren, while we magnify our office and defend our calling with all our power, let us not forget that the most precious compensation for which we can look is in the joy that comes through the service of God and our fellowmen.

May I reach

That purest heaven, be to other souls
The cup of strength in some great agony,
Enkindle noble ardor, feed pure love,
Be the sweet presence of a good diffused,
And in diffusion, ever more intense.

Easton, Pa.

ARTICLE VIII.

OUR CHURCH SCHOOLS: THEIR OBJECT AND THEIR METHOD.

BY PROFESSOR HOLMES DYSINGER, D.D.

A recent writer who speaks with authority on the subject says: "The question of moral education is the heart of the educational problem of our time." It is all but universally conceded that our schools have failed to produce that rich fruitage of moral character which is rightly regarded throughout the Christian world as the crown of culture. Accordingly the duty is incumbent upon all who are charged with the responsibility of providing for the training of the young—from the kindergarten to the university—"to reconstruct all education" with the moral requirements of human society ever held in view. Our leading educators of all classes recognize the fact, "that the building of character is the real aim of the schools and the ultimate reason for the expenditure of millions for their maintenance."

It is justly claimed that moral training is never lost sight of in the founding of church schools. Indeed this is invariably put forward as their excuse for being, and the ground of their appeal for public support and patronage. But it is hardly open to question that they must share in the responsibility for the failure of our system of education to make ethical principles regnant in our modern life. For many years the church schools had the leadership in every department of higher education. They not only inculcated a pure morality, but appealed to religious sanctions for human conduct, and thus endeavored to reach motives that are substantial and enduring. It is evident, however, to even the most casual observer, that "the hydraulic force of religion" has not been brought to bear upon motives and conduct with sufficient effectiveness to stem the tide of "that rank materialism that threatens to engulf us all." It therefore becomes us who maintain church schools for higher education to interrogate ourselves seriously, in order to discover, if possible, how far we are responsible for this failure, and address ourselves to the im-

portant task of providing an adequate remedy. Our opportunity and responsibility will be discoverable, if we place before our minds clearly the objects aimed at by the Church in founding her own schools, and the methods that must be pursued to attain those ends.

The end of all true education, and pre-eminently that which is kept in view in this discussion and which is commonly called "higher" by way of distinction, regarded as the completed product resulting from the combined action of all the forces that enter into the process, is Godlike character, embodied in full-rounded manhood; considered as an individual force, it is self-mastery and self-direction; viewed in its relation to the world of thought, feeling and conduct, it is the ability to enter into sympathy with truth of every form and human experience of every kind; conceived of as a process of unfolding the powers latent in the individual as a complex being, it is the harmonious development of all man's powers, including his moral and spiritual nature as well as his intellectual and physical endowments. This last conception is the most comprehensive, including the others at some stage of the process. It is the ideal education which the church school sets before itself as the goal of its endeavor.

Further consideration will disclose the fact that the Church has a three-fold object in establishing her own schools for higher learning. The first has in view the individual; the second, the Church; and the third, society in its largest relations. The design is to provide for the needs of man in every relation of life. A glance at the constituent elements of an education, viewed as the harmonious development of all man's powers, will set in clear light the object of the church school in its relation to the individual and its duty to the same.

Time need not be spent in discussing that upon which all agree, viz., that the acquisition of knowledge and its systemization, and the development of the ability to think clearly and logically,—to resolve complex ideas into their simpler elements, to distinguish accurately between related lines of thought, and to reason to a correct conclusion from given premises—are constituent elements of a sound education. All schools agree on these points and have them more or less clearly in view in all their work. They diverge widely however when the question pertains to the

kind of knowledge to be acquired, reduced to a system and made subject to the laws of thought. The church school concedes without argument that for the ends of mere information and discipline, it is not a matter of so much importance what branches of knowledge are taught, as it is for the student to see the subject under investigation in its relation to other forms and phases of truth. But on the other hand as the Church regards the spiritual as the real and the enduring, so the highest and most valuable knowledge is that of the spirit and must not be omitted in the training of the young. She at once recognizes as in harmony with her own teaching for centuries the fact that the last word of true science and the accepted conclusion of the best philosophy, as well as Divine Revelation, teach that the spirit and reason rule the universe. Accordingly she insists that what pertains to man's highest nature must not be crowded out of the curricula of her schools. Moreover, she emphasizes the fact that, the reasoning faculties must be trained upon spiritual truth, so that the individual may be able to justify his convictions and conclusions on logical and philosophical grounds in the sphere of ethics and religion. That so few so-called educated men can do this is due in part at least to the fact that they have not trained their intellectual powers in the use of spiritual truth as subject-matter for serious and candid investigation. The church school plants itself on an impregnable rock, when it makes the crown of her achievement through intellectual training to be the ability to reason on ethical and spiritual subject-matter with such comprehensiveness, clearness, consistency and force as to reach conclusions that are at once compelling and authoritative. This is a primary reason for its being.

The ability to appreciate truth of every form and reproduce the thought and feeling, the life and experience of any age or clime, is an essential factor in the education that completes and develops all man's powers. The church school that is true to its mission keeps the mind open and receptive, in a sympathetic attitude toward new truth as well as tenacious of that which has been tested by experience and not found wanting. It aims at bringing the entire realm of thought, feeling and action within the range of vision, reducing prejudice and provincialism to the minimum, and making the tastes and sympathies as well as the

standards of judgment cosmopolitan. It is conceded that this is an unrealized and unrealizable ideal in our educational program. But it is the goal toward which our schools must move, *if they would meet the reasonable demands of our modern life.*

That this element of sympathy is lacking in much of what passes for education in our day is evidenced at every turn. The specialism that characterizes present methods fosters narrowness, and even when it develops depth, it often does so at the expense of breadth. The contempt with which the investigator in one line will treat the claims of the specialist in another; the hostility of science to theology and theology to science, for example, as it is often exhibited by the authorities in both departments of knowledge, attests the statement. But it is evidenced in many other ways—in our inability to enter sympathetically into the experiences of the life above or beneath us; in the unwillingness of the girls and boys who are attending school to share in the work and help to bear the burdens of the home even during vacation, or when their school days have come to an end; in the refusal of the so-called educated members of the family to relieve those who have been less fortunate and need assistance; in the minister who has completed his course of study and enters upon his calling, but finds no pleasure or interest in mingling with his people and trying to enter into their experiences of success and failure, joy and sorrow. The true and complete education enlarges and enriches the life, and renders man capable of entering into the experience of others individually and collectively, and in whatever form it may be embodied; whether it be expressed in literature or art, science or religion; in social customs or political institutions; or in personal idiosyncrasies and individual conduct. The church school that loses sight of and fails to develop this power in the young entrusted to its care fails to fulfill one of the primary objects of its existence.

Self-mastery holds the first place in importance, though last in the order of development, among the constituent elements of a sound and complete education. Most of the effort of the day is directed toward getting the mastery over outward conditions. This receives so much attention in our educational programs chiefly because of the large amount of time spent in the study of science, pure and applied. But a true system of education leads to self-

mastery and self-direction and issues in fully-rounded manhood.

The child is essentially a bundle of impulses; and most people physically mature have not gained much more control over themselves than the child. They are still creatures of impulse. By proper education impulse is brought under the control of the will and conscience. The teacher's first effort is to secure the attention of the child, and to train it so that it may be able to direct its attention to a given object at will. One of the main purposes of a course of training in school is to enable the will to get such control over the other faculties of the mind as to make them obedient to its behests. When the student has arrived at that stage in his development where he can fix his mind in continuous intelligent thought for fifteen, yea for five, consecutive minutes on any desired subject, he is well educated. And he who has not to some degree at least attained this mastery over the powers of his mind is not educated, even though he boast university training and high-sounding degrees.

This self-mastery shows itself not simply in controlling impulse and directing the attention, but also in the performance of duty, whether it requires mental or physical exertion. No one ever shows greater mastery over himself than when he does what he ought to do, when he ought to do it, whether he likes to do it or not. A man may write well, preach well, sing well, or fight well, when he feels like it. But most men discover that these things must be done when they do not feel like doing them at all. A sound education aims at giving a man such a mastery over himself that he can direct all his energies to a given end according to the dictates of his judgment and conscience.

Possibly this self-mastery never appears in stronger light than when one is able to do the right because it is right, even though he knows that his choice of the right must issue in material loss and personal suffering—when the sense of obligation is stronger than inclination, and he accordingly chooses goodness and truth however great the sacrifice. An education that issues in such mastery not only develops the intellectual powers of the individual, but makes men morally better, purer within, and sweeter, kindlier, stronger in outward conduct. The will exercising its functions in harmony with the principles of righteousness, and under the influence of right motives has all the other powers of

the mind under its control and orders conduct in accord with the imperative of conscience enlightened by the truth. When this has been attained the goal of all true education has been reached. For such mastery issues in the perfection of character, the crowning achievement of man.

Respecting the individual to be educated the church school sets before itself the task of training in knowledge, power, sympathy, and self-mastery with the emphasis upon those moral and spiritual forces that control conduct and determine destiny.

But the Church has founded and maintained her own schools for her own sake. The instinct of self-preservation has impelled her to do this in order to provide and train an adequate and efficient ministry. The secular schools could not do this if they would. Without her own colleges and theological seminaries to direct young men to the ministry and prepare them for this work, its ranks would soon be so depleted as to leave most of our congregations without pastors. It is a fact well known that in our General Synod there is not a single institution for higher education that does not have its theological department or seminary closely affiliated with it, and that was not founded primarily because of the demand for more ministers on the territory. Wherever, therefore, this object is not kept in the foreground by those who are entrusted with the management of our church schools, they are proving recreant to their trust, and should be replaced by those who would be loyal to the interests of the Church that supports them. This truth is so self-evident that it requires no further discussion at this time.

Too often, however, our church schools have been looked upon as designed exclusively for those preparing for the ministry. No Church can attain any very high state of development without good schools in which she can train her laity to be loyal, faithful and serviceable to her own interests. An intelligent, loyal and consecrated laity is as necessary to the Church's prosperity and perpetuity as is a thoroughly furnished and consecrated ministry. The strength of a denomination can be correctly gauged by the character of its schools and the support she gives them. The one that neglects higher education has no future however great and extensive its present activities and opportunities. The Church that does not provide for its own will eke out

a precarious existence, only to become extinct sooner or later; while the one that entrusts the education of its young to other denominations, or what is worse, to those of no religious convictions, will be rewarded with indifference to, if not depreciation of, her claims and her work. If the young people of the Lutheran Church are educated by those out of sympathy with her life and doctrine and specific work, how can we expect them to know her history, to be proud of her achievements, love her services, and aid in maintaining her interests and enhancing her influence? To provide an adequate ministry and train an efficient and loyal laity is one of the main objects of the Church schools, and must not be pushed into the background, if they are to fulfil their purpose and mission.

We conceive of church schools as having a third object, not so sharply defined in the minds of founders and supporters possibly as those already mentioned. This object may be stated as the contribution the church schools make to the solution of the problems furnished by our modern complex social system. If the Church Universal has a mission of service in the world, so must each essential branch of it, it is natural to suppose, make some contribution to the sum total of the forces and influences that make for righteousness, the betterment of human conditions and the ultimate regeneration of human society. Let a few particulars be noted in respect to which the Lutheran Church has some things to offer that must be reckoned with before a satisfactory solution is found, and should not be overlooked by those who teach and prepare the courses of instruction for our church schools.

First. What is claimed by her theologians is beyond a peradventure true, viz., that the Lutheran Church has the most scriptural body of doctrine in Christendom. Why then should not all her schools inculcate that doctrine and defend the truth? Is it not truth that is mighty and must prevail? Why then should it be thrust aside or ignored simply because it is not included in the programs of the would-be leading educators of the time? Whatever else may emerge from the present chaos of ethical and theological theory, one thing is certain, viz., the final ethics and theology will rest not upon the shifting sands of human speculation, but upon the authority of the Divine Word. Why then

should we withdraw from the vantage ground that is ours? What contribution of equal value in the solution of our modern social problem to that of the inculcation of the principles in harmony with which it must be finally settled, can be made by any individual or organization?

Secondly. Lutheranism has been aptly described as "a mode of viewing, and receiving and living the truths of Christianity." It is a specific form of Christianity, and as such has characteristics of its own. It can therefore not only be differentiated from other forms, but it can be embodied in a system that can be taught. Without attempting to give the characteristics of Lutheranism in detail, it is sufficient to state at this point that they set forth not only a distinct system of doctrine, but also a distinct type of piety, and principles of conduct that are rational and practicable. Its pre-eminent characteristic is that it is evangelical, and therefore adapted for all conditions of mankind in every age and every clime. It was quite common not many years ago in some quarters to claim certain national peculiarities as essential characteristics of Lutheranism, and try to draw sharp lines of distinction between German, Scandinavian and American Lutheran Churches. But this has happily died out almost entirely, except in the case of a few belated travelers who were overtaken by the night while they were yet in the woods. Lutheranism in its essence is the same the world over, whether you find it in Germany, Scandinavia, Rome, the steppes of Asia, the jungles of Africa, the plains of South America, or in our own Republic. It is characterized by the same filial relation to God, justification by faith alone as its central doctrine, absolute confidence in and submission to the Word of God, and a type of piety that is humble, trustful, unobtrusive and joyous. One of our young men of rare scholarship, and enthusiastically devoted to his Church, said not long since, "I never understood Lutheranism until I studied in Germany. I was born and brought up in a Lutheran parsonage, but I was half-ashamed of my Church. I did not comprehend her spirit, and did not understand what it meant to be a Lutheran." It is to be greatly feared that many could be found who would be compelled to make the same acknowledgement, if they spoke with the same frankness on the subject. But such cases ought to be rare, and would be, if our

schools kept prominently in view the objects of their foundation, and the duty of embodying and expressing, exhibiting and inculcating the true spirit of genuine Lutheranism.

Thirdly. We are promptly met by the assertion that these forces count for little or nothing in our modern social system. Scriptural authority is repudiated, and our system of truth is declared to be antiquated and not adapted to meet the requirements of present conditions. These are not sufficient to deal successfully with those who are dominated by commercial ideals, and are unheard amid the din of machinery and the roar of modern industrialism. The new social relations must be moralized. It is conceded that the Church and her schools must answer the questions of each age in harmony with the modes of thought and feeling and expression of that age as well as in consistency with their own principles. The Lutheran Church has ever done that where she has been true to her doctrine spirit and life. So she has her answer for the questions raised by modern social conditions, and her method of social service. She believes and teaches that society is made up of individuals, and its transformation can be brought about only by dealing with units and not with the mass. She maintains that there can be no regeneration of society except through the individual; that there is no permanent reform effected by external means, but by the freedom that comes through the transforming power of the Gospel. She attaches little value to the blare of trumpets, the unfurling of banners, the efficiency of legislation in making men moral or religious, but puts forth her supreme effort in making men Christlike, convinced that it is the most effective means of bringing peace, prosperity and happiness to men—the surest method of inaugurating the reign of righteousness and truth in the world. The program of the Lutheran Church for social service is the transformation of the individual by the power of the Gospel, brought to men through every form of ministry in Christ's name, operated through the Church and eleemosynary institutions of all kinds, with every safeguard that wise and just laws rigidly enforced, give to the weak, the oppressed and the unfortunate. Such a program is worthy of the attention of the reformers of all ages.

In general it may be said that the objects of the church school

cannot be attained by following the lead of the secular schools, and especially that of the large universities. This would be impossible not only because of the limited resources of the church school but because the aims and ideals of the university center in material achievement or pure intellectualism with the shifting standards of utilitarian ethics, resting on expediency and making the conventional the measure of right, having as its end a dogmatic specialism that arrogantly flaunts its omniscience in the face of all who challenge its conclusions or mounts the throne of self-satisfied agnosticism. With this spirit and method the church schools can have nothing in common. On the contrary their legitimate work can be done only by keeping their own objects in view and providing for the same in their courses of study. By this method of the inculcation of the young in the principles for which the Church stands they must make their chief contribution to the solution of the problems of our modern life, and aid in leading present thought out of the maze. No one doubts the complexity and consequent difficulty of solving present social problems. They are so interwoven with human self-interest that only the highest expression of altruism, as embodied in self-sacrifice can furnish a solution. Then why abandon accepted principles and tested methods for untried theories?

Nor is the inculcation of our own principles and methods in which our faith and convictions are embodied sectarianism. It is common honesty. It is keeping faith with those who made sacrifices in order to found schools that the Church of their love might be perpetuated and fulfil its mission upon the earth. The Lutheran Church is not called upon to support schools in order to make non-descript Christians or indifferent religionists or even Methodists, Presbyterians, etc. There are other and better equipped schools for doing this work than the Lutheran Church can furnish. If she had such aims in founding her schools, it would be better to direct her gifts into other channels of benevolent and eleemosynary activity or turn her money over directly to the institutions established for those ends. Our church schools are founded to train the young in or into the Lutheran conception of truth in general and of Christianity in particular. For by ranging ourselves under the banner inscribed with her name we proclaim our acceptance of her doctrine, and

acknowledge our obligation to defend it against all assailants, or we brand ourselves as false witnesses.

As in all forms of truth that require the consent of the will as well as the assent of the understanding, the indirect method is by far the most successful in securing effective lodgment of ideas in the minds of the young, so the objects of the church school, and especially in those particulars in which it differs from the secular, are best attained through the personality of those who are charged with the responsibility of administration and instruction in the same. If therefore moral and spiritual truth is of the greatest worth; if the ability to reason accurately and conclusively on our ethical convictions is the highest intellectual plane man reaches; if the power to enter sympathetically into the experience of man as man, whatever be his age, clime or stage of advancement in culture and civilization, is characteristic of true education; if mastery over self rather than the forces of the natural world is the crown of culture; if manhood embodying character fitted to the mold eternal realities is the end and aim of our discipline, the chief need in the educational work of our Church and time is not money, but men; not material sources but dominant personality; not larger faculties and more numerous courses of study, not increased endowment and better equipment, but the restoration of the personal factor to its rightful and commanding place in our educational system. Extensive appliances and large resources, scholarly faculties and numerous courses have many advantages, indeed are greatly needed in most of our schools. Hence they are neither depreciated nor regarded as unimportant. They are all but indispensable in our day. But they should not occupy the first place in the thought of the public or the aims of our educators.

The main thing in education is the sympathetic and inspiring contact of the pupil with the live, enthusiastic, consecrated teacher. A man of this kind is a whole corps of instructors in himself. He makes a college after the idea of a Garfield—a Mark Hopkins sitting on the end of a log with eager listeners gathered around him; or, a Socrates followed about the streets of Athens by the noble youth of the city, eagerly catching what fell from his lips; or an Arnold revolutionizing the educational methods of England while molding the rebellious boys at Rugby

to high ideals of truth and duty. Booker T. Washington in his autobiography writes of General Samuel C. Armstrong, the head of Hampton Institute, when Mr. Washington was there as a student, as follows:

"One might have removed from Hampton all the buildings, classrooms, teachers and industries and given the men and women there the opportunity of coming into daily contact with General Armstrong, and that alone would have been a liberal education. The older I grow the more I am convinced that there is no education which one can get from books and costly apparatus that is equal to that which may be gotten from contact with great men and great women."

In another place he writes: "The greatest benefits I got out of my life at Hampton Institute perhaps may be classified under two heads: First, contact with a great man, General Samuel C. Armstrong, who was in my opinion the rarest, strongest and most beautiful character that it has been my privilege to meet. Second, at Hampton I not only learned that it was not a disgrace to labor, but learned to love labor, not alone for its financial value, but for labor's own sake, and for the independence and self-reliance which the ability to do something which the world wants brings. At that institution I got my first taste of what it meant to live a life of usefulness, my first knowledge of the fact that the happiest individuals are those who do the most to make others useful and happy." How vast is the difference between what Booker T. Washington got out of his social life at Hampton Institute and the modicum knowledge with which so many boys come home from college to loaf and smoke, to swear and swagger, and squander their fathers' money! And yet is the boy alone to be blamed? Is not this state of affairs, wherever it exists to be credited in part at least to the schools? attributable to the fact that boys at college have not come in touch with a General Armstrong?

It is a matter of great importance that a man learn to reason logically and speak correctly, but it is a matter of infinitely more worth that he think purely, feel nobly and act wisely and justly. Every parent is desirous that his children have the best opportunities for intellectual culture that he can afford, and most reasonably too. But is this the end of his solicitude? The ques-

tions furnished by mathematics or physics, history or philosophy are insignificant compared with the problem of life. In its solution whether furnished by parent or preacher or teacher, personality is the chief factor. Its elimination changes the terms of the equation so materially that we have only the problem of brute creation, not of human life to solve. Moreover it is personality that leaves the deepest impress upon the minds of others. If one were to ask the graduates of our colleges and universities what it was in their professors that had been most influential in molding their life and character, the answer in almost every case would be that the personality of the teacher was of far greater worth than the instruction he had given. Students forget the teaching, but they never forget the impression that the teacher makes upon their minds through his personal character.

Accordingly the friends of true education, and especially those representative of the Church, cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that the personal factor must have the first place and consideration in all our educational work. It is through this agency that the pulpit must get its chief support in neutralizing the commercial spirit of the age. The Church and the school as they hold up higher ideals of life, and embody them in ministers and teachers, must and do oppose this spirit, and are the chief, though not the sole agents in doing so. How much men like the elder Aggazi are needed, not only in our schools of advanced learning, but in other walks of life as well—men who do not have time to make money, though they could accumulate it at the rate of \$500 or \$1000 per night. Great is the need for more men like Booker T. Washington, who will give themselves to the elevation of the degraded and down-trodden, and turn aside every offer to make money that will not contribute to that end. Neither Agassiz as scientist nor Mr. Washington as the eloquent advocate and educator of his race has left as strong an impress upon humanity in general and his own constituency in particular, as each has by means of vigorous and enthusiastic personality, ever setting before his pupils lofty ideals of life and duty.

It is chiefly through personality and not from books and appliances that the student gets his views of life. How important therefore is it that corps of instructors be composed of men who are strong, noble and reverent; men of strong personality and of

large views of life; men incapable of petty bickerings and jealous rivalries; men whose very presence will generate an atmosphere charged with the electricity of ideas instead of the carbonic acid gas of mean personalities; men who are above the littleness of place-hunting, and are willing to serve in the positions in which gifts and Providence have placed them; men who scorn the pettiness of partizanship, and can see good in a personal enemy; men who have the grace of tolerance along with the grit of conviction; men like James Russell Lowell, who would regularly and cheerfully sacrifice whole evenings, that would have been spent most profitably and enjoyably at his books, in order to give a crude but promising youth broader, truer, nobler views of life.

The crowning influence of personality is in the sphere of religion and morality. The tendency in educational circles has been and still is to divorce culture from all religious influences. The Church is strongly set against this tendency. But it is destined to prevail outside of the church schools, except where personality is the dominant factor, and where that is permeated by religious conviction. There are few who have not noted the deleterious effect of the life at our large schools upon the religious convictions, and the interest of our young people in the Church. How many of those who were faithful and active in all their Church duties before they entered the college or university are rarely found within the sanctuary after their return. One reason for this is not difficult to find and one which gives emphasis to the contention that the personal factor is the most important in education.

The traditional faith of a man must become personal, or he remains an infant in spiritual things. *Indeed every man sooner or later in the light of his own experience and knowledge, sometimes deliberately, more frequently without being aware of it, "enters upon a revisal, more or less critical of his religious and philosophical creed. While this process is going on, the school, whether it be a college or university, becomes of necessity the Church, and the teachers and associates are for the time being priests and oracles; for it is in the light of what these attest and prove that the old creed is reaffirmed or questioned or renounced. And what if this Church has no religion and the priests have no consecration? What again if they are thoroughly and unaffected-*

edly Christian? In a crisis like this, and it comes in the life of every thoughtful student, a word, a look from the living teacher, a chance remark in the one direction or the other, an earnest and candid spirit, or scoffing and dogmatic doubt, or the combined impression his intellectual temper and personal spirit have in thousands of instances been fraught with bane or blessing to his confiding pupil." The indifference to religion and the Church shown by so many young people when they return from school is often due to the fact that in passing through this crisis, they have lost their grip on religious truth, and largely because it had no hold upon those who were dominating their lives.

It should not be overlooked that personality is a determining factor with most young men in the choice of a profession. Not only indirectly by weakening religious conviction, and even destroying it in some instances, but quite as often by the direct personal influence of the teacher have young men in recent years been turned away from the Gospel ministry. It is a fact well known that by example and often too by precept a life of self-denial has been discredited, and one of self-seeking and material gain set up as the ideal,—which is utterly at variance with all that the Church stands for, and her schools as well where they are true to their purpose. We do not hesitate to attribute the decline in the number of candidates for the ministry from our church schools in no small measure to the example, personal influence and ideals held up before the students by the professors themselves. In days gone by most of the professors' chairs were filled by men who had taken upon themselves the vows of the Church, and were interested in her welfare. But for some time it has been popular to decry this practice, and to eliminate the Church's influence even from her own schools as far as possible. Only the specialist, who in the minds of this class must be a layman of course, whose interests in the Church may not go farther than the service she can render in advancing his own personal and professional ambitions is thought to be qualified to fill a professorship. How can it be expected that there will be any positive influence exerted in behalf of a cause so foreign to the ideals, habits of thought and practices of men of this class? In most instances they assume a critical attitude toward the Church and her ministry. Their influence is accordingly against rather

than for those agencies that make the church school a possibility. If the Church is to continue to do her work and perpetuate herself, her schools must be manned by men whose personal influence will lead others to consecrate themselves to her service.

The church schools have simply to remain true to the purpose of their foundation and their future is assured. They have always held to the only solution of what has been called "the heart of the educational problem," viz., the inculcation of sound morality, resting on religious sanctions and animated by religious motives. They always lose when they abandon their own ideals, cut themselves loose from their moorings and drift out into the current of secularism. Besides the church schools never had a better opportunity for coming into possession of their own. The secular schools that have had the lead for years and have claimed the whole field of education as their own, in many cases, acknowledge that their efforts at inculcating morality have failed because it lacked the dynamic, and are turning to the Church for help. Further, the call for that personal touch which is so effective in molding character and determining destiny was never so loud and insistent as at the present time. The church school with its limited numbers gives its professor the largest opportunity to come into the most intimate relation with the students and to exert of his personality for good or evil in the largest measure. A little personal attention, encouragement and sympathy, "a word fitly spoken," is invaluable in individual cases and goes far toward solving problems of the greatest import in the life of the young. Nor have the church schools, that have remained true to the object of their foundation, to contend seriously with those evils which threaten the existence of some of the institutions that have turned aside from their original purpose. They are not frequented in large numbers by those "who make the side-show the whole circus, and are a menace to the institution's future." The following indictment of university life, recently made by the President of Princeton University, is not true of the church institution that has held to the purpose of its founders: "The indifference of parents whether their sons really acquire an education or mere surface polish and other outward evidences by which 'a college bred' man is to be distinguished from his less fortunate fellows; the complete dissociation of the life of the

student when beyond the classroom doors with the work done within them, and absence of serious purpose on the part of the majority of students." A large majority of the students in our church schools are there for the serious purpose of securing an education, and they are encouraged by their parents to seek the genuine article. The church school, therefore, in the future as in the past will have to furnish a large proportion of the scholars, as well as the preachers of the Gospel.

It is a matter for congratulation that the schools of the General Synod are not lagging in the rear of the procession. Never have we had so many interested and investigating the questions provoked by the modern trend of education. Besides the Board of Education, alert to every movement that will advance the cause has removed in part at least the pressure that resulted from too limited resources. It has rallied the whole Church to the more generous support of all our institutions of learning, helped to carry financial burdens with greater ease, unified the educational aims and efforts of the entire body and stimulated all to greater zeal and activity. We have passed that experimental stage. Every biennium, like the one just closed, should record a giant stride in advance, so that our schools may stand in the front rank of the educational hosts of the land.

The conclusion we reach is that the church schools—those of our own denomination as well as others—have specific work for our time; that they will perform it by remaining true to the purpose of their founders, viz., to furnish an education that develops all man's powers harmoniously; that will serve the Church in carrying forward her work; that will minister to the needs of humanity in every line of service; that will inscribe on their banners and embody in life and work the sentiment of the motto—"For Christ and the Church." This must be accomplished primarily through the power of personality—the character and spirit of the men to whom the young of the Church are entrusted for training—men who are loyal to the Church and consecrated to her ideals of service. We have come to the kingdom for such a time and work as this. Let us arise and possess our own.

Western Theological Seminary, Atchison, Kansas.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

HENRY ALTEMUS CO. PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The Bible as Good Reading. By Albert J. Beveridge. 12 mo., Cloth. Pp. 94.

This little book in ten brief chapters, will no doubt accomplish good out of all proportion to its size. It has an interesting origin. Two tired men were spending their vacation "in camp in the deep woods, many days' canoe trip from a human being." Following the advice of Emerson they had taken no reading matter, except that one had brought his Bible. After some days they began to pine for reading. The one who had brought the Bible suggested that it had more good reading in it than any other book. He began to read it aloud to the very great delight of his companion. "By chance, one of the guides was near and he sat down and listened. The next day all the guides were there. The day after, the reading was delayed and Indian Charley modestly suggested, Isn't it about time to have some more of that there Bible? And more of it they had." This incident led to the writing of these chapters, which first appeared in *The Saturday Evening Post*.

The book is well worth reading for its own sake, but it will be read also because its author is a distinguished United States Senator. He approaches his subject without any critical pretensions and translates some of its stories into the thought and language of today in the spirit of unquestioning faith and with a freshness of expression that is most charming. He has read the Bible as it is meant to be read and found in it the delight which has captivated men like Franklin, Webster and Gladstone.

The author deplors the fact that lawyers do not read the Bible today as did the great leaders of the bar in the past. He says "I have advised every law student who has ever consulted me to study the laws of Moses before he begins his Blackstone, and keep on studying the laws of Moses after he has completed his law course. And then keep on . . . during his practice." He declares the Bible to be the most quotable book in all literature, surpassing Shakespeare, Dante, Milton, Horace, the Koran and Confucius combined.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE GERMAN LITERARY BOARD. BURLINGTON, IOWA.

Mysticisms: Psychology, History and Relation to Scriptural Church and Christian Life. By Rev. J. B. Remensnyder, D.D., LL.D. Paper cover, illustrated. Pp. 25. Price 25 cents; by the dozen, \$2.00 postpaid.

This brief monograph is a credit to the printer's art as well as to the talented author. The subject is clearly outlined in its several aspects. The danger of a false, morbid mysticism is shown. On the other hand the value of a deep mystical experience grounded in the Word and wrought by the Holy Spirit is emphasized. Luther, while drawn by his spiritual yearnings toward mysticism, apprehended and exposed its perversions as practiced by the Zwickau prophets, insisting earnestly on the necessity of cherishing the external, objective Word, in which the Holy Spirit is present and through which he ever operates.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

A Commentary on the Holy Bible by Various Writers. Edited by the Rev. J. R. Dummelow, M.A., Queen's College, Cambridge. Complete in one volume, with General Articles and Maps. Pp. 1092. Price \$2.50 net.

This volume is a remarkable illustration of *Multum in parvo*. In turning its pages one is constantly surprised to find how much valuable information and genuine help to the understanding of the Scriptures have been crowded within it.

Besides the running comment on the text there are over one hundred and fifty pages of introductory matter covering a great variety of topics, such as, General Introduction to the Bible, The Creation Story and Science, Genesis and the Babylonian Inscriptions, The Laws of Hammurabi, The Messianic Hope, The Synoptic Problem, The Person of Jesus Christ, The Trinity, Miracle, &c., &c. All of these articles are well written, scholarly, up-to-date in every way, thoroughly critical and yet safely conservative.

Besides these "General Articles" there is a quite full and satisfactory "Introduction" to each individual book, covering such points as the author, the date of writing, the contents, the purpose, &c. For the general reader, and for the average Bible student, these articles will be found amply sufficient and really much more helpful than the more elaborate discussions found in the

large commentaries, or in the encyclopedias and Bible dictionaries.

The contents on the text are necessarily brief, and yet they are genuinely illuminating. When the meaning is already plain little or nothing is said, thus leaving room for explanation where explanation is needed. Time and space are saved also by a most admirable system of cross-references, which also tends to make the Bible its own interpreter.

We can very heartily recommend this commentary for the use of Sunday School teachers, Bible students and general readers. We know of no other single volume commentary that will so admirably and so fully meet their needs. And even ministers who may have larger commentaries on their shelves, will find that by keeping this volume within easy reach they will save themselves a great deal of time and trouble, and will yet have at hand just the information and help desired.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON. NEW YORK.

The Atonement. By the Rev. James Stalker, D.D., Professor of Church History and Christian Ethics in the United Free Church College, Aberdeen. Cloth. Pp. 138. Price \$1.00.

This volume from the pen of an eminent author consists of three lectures on the Atonement, a subject of deep and perennial interest. The titles of the lectures are the following: The New Testament Situation, The Old Testament Preparation, and The Modern Justification.

The New Testament Situation is admirably summed up in sentences like these: "Nowhere in the New Testament, not even in the Gospels, does the history of Jesus either end with his burial or commence with his birth; and while fragments of the Christian community may be satisfied with a fragment of the Gospel, Christianity itself must keep possession of the whole gift of God." "If this Man was, in his origin and destiny, all that the New Testament represents him to be, then it harmonizes with the entire phenomenon to believe that his death, besides being the key to the mystery of his earthly fortunes, was a transcendent act, effecting for human beings in the world unseen a change by which have been secured both their peace with God here and their unending felicity hereafter; and this objective result of the death of Christ, anterior to our experience, is the primary benefit and virtue of the Atonement."

The author justly believes that the doctrine of the Atonement can not be understood "without an appreciative knowledge of the

sacrificial system of the old dispensation." He has no respect for the negative criticism which professes to believe "that the sacrificial system was the product of a late and decadent phase of religion," foisted on the people by a designing priesthood. He finds that the prophets arrive practically at the same point as the priests. "Christ is a victim, and his death a sacrifice; his soul was given for the souls of men; and, through the sufferings of the innocent, the guilty are raised to glory, honor, and immortality."

In the third lecture of the volume, on *The Modern Justification*, the author seeks to set forth a historical view of the modern mind on the Atonement. The Reformation, of course, re-established practically the Anselmic theory in the strong insistence of the Reformers on the doctrine of justification by faith. The first strong opposition to this came from the Council of Trent which unhappily confused the order of salvation, making no distinction between justification and sanctification.

Osiander is quoted as having rendered useful service in calling Protestantism away from a one-sided view of justification—a view which left justification too isolated. While the service of Osiander is not to be ignored, his view approximated that of Rome.

The third movement by which the Atonement was brought to the front was Arminianism. The exaggeration of the doctrine of election naturally resulted in a limitation of the Atonement itself, "for the Son could have died only for as many as the Father had chosen from all eternity." "Thus there came into theology the dreariest set of discussions by which it has ever been darkened; the Atonement being reckoned as a quantative magnitude; Christ been represented as if he had paid the exact equivalent of the sins of so many persons and no more."

The author seeks to eliminate the idea of election entirely from the Atonement. He says it has absolutely nothing to do with it. There is a deep mystery in election and "in the relation between the human and the divine wills in salvation." Salvation is of God; "yet on the other hand, the will of man is free; it can take and leave God's offer; and it is urged to exert itself as if everything depended on its own energy." "This mystery of God's will and man's will lies inside of the doctrine of election," our author declares, and not in that of the Atonement. The Scriptures clearly set forth that there is no limit to the Atonement. Here then is the difficulty in which Calvinism has always found itself and against which Arminianism was a protest. Vainly, it seems to us, does Dr. Stalker protest against the confusion of the doctrines of election and atonement as taught by Calvinism. History shows that men have always con-

nected them. He is perfectly right, however, in dismissing election in this discussion and in quoting the deliverance of the Synod of Dort, "that the death of Christ is sufficient for all, adapted to all, and freely offered to all."

Horace Bushnell is next mentioned as having recalled theologians to the recognition of the true relation between the Father and the Son in the redemption of the world. He maintained that the death of God the Father participated in the pain suffered by the Son.

John Macleod Campbell and Albert Ritschl are introduced because of their rejection of the doctrine of the Atonement while really maintaining all the truth for which it stands—the reconciliation of God and man.

Dr. Stalker, however, finds in Campbell an idea which gives him a hint of the solution of the mystery of the Atonement. It is the idea that if the vilest sinner repented God would forgive him. If all the sins of all the sons of men had been committed by one man, he would have been forgiven if he had thoroughly repented. But, we ask, may we assume that any man would have ever felt godly sorrow for sin, had God withheld his love, especially as it is seen in the gift of Christ? We doubt it.

The ingenious argument proceeds. It is said that "when genuine contrition is shown, the righteous wrath of the soul is appeased, and the offender is taken back with a warmth and an interest never felt for him before he had sinned." "God is reconciled when Christ offers, in behalf of the race, a representative and universal repentance, which literally breaks his heart, so that he dies of it." This, then, is the Atonement! But is there any proof that Christ ever repented of anything? He never confessed a sin, for he was sinless. He could not have repented of sins of which he was not guilty. We can understand how he could suffer, "the just for the unjust," in the place and in behalf of others; but it is inconceivable to us that he should have repented for others.

While we can not agree with the *theory* of the Atonement advanced by Dr. Stalker, we do heartily commend the book to the ministry. It is full of sweet and blessed truth, expressed in fine diction and in a reverent spirit. He holds on to the fundamental facts of Christ's work in reconciling God and man.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Quiet Talks With World Winners. By S. D. Gordon, Author of "Quiet Talks About Jesus," etc. Cloth, 12 mo. Pp. 280. Price 75 cents net.

Quiet Talks with World Winners is true to its title. It is an

appeal to Christians to win the world for Christ—the whole world. Special emphasis is properly laid on the heathen world. The author is fully acquainted with the dire need of the slums of the cities, yet this need is not the greatest, for it is overshadowed by that of heathen lands. “The vastness of the numbers there, the utter ignorance, the smallness of their chance of getting any of the knowledge and uplift of the Gospel, all go to spell out that word ‘greatest.’ The awful cumulative power of sin, unchecked by the common moral standards of life, with the terrific momentum of centuries; the common temptations known to us, but with a fierceness and subtlety wholly unknown to us in Christian lands—and yet how terrifically fierce and cunningly subtle some of us know them to be!—These make every letter in that word ‘greatest’ stand out in biggest capitals, and in blackest, inkiest ink.”

The book consists of two series of discussions: one on World-Winning and the other on Winning Forces. Each of these is treated under seven heads, setting forth in a luminous way the great comprehensive themes.

The book is not learned. It is not scientific in the strict sense. It is only “Quiet Talks,” but such Talks! They sparkle, they move the heart, they convince the head, they arouse the will. They are full of facts illustrated not by figures but by wonderful stories. O, ye preachers who have never learned to talk plainly and simply to people, and who are perhaps heart-broken over empty pews, read this book. You will find many sermons in it that will keep your people interested. You may even learn to imitate the simplicity and directness of these “Quiet Talks” and thus make your preaching a revelation to others and to yourselves.

This is one of those little books that ought to be in every library. It is just as interesting to the layman as to the clergyman. Its circulation in a congregation would do much, it seems to us, to deepen spiritual life and quicken activity in the kingdom of God.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

GENERAL COUNCIL PUBLISHING HOUSE.— PHILADELPHIA.

The Separated Life. A Biblical Defense of the Divinity of Christ. By John Edwin Whitteker, D.D., Author of *Analysis of the Augsburg Confession*, etc. With an introduction by Theodore E. Schmauk. Cloth, 12 mo. Pp. 204. Price \$1.

Dr. Whitteker has produced a fine Biblical apologetic. His treatment of his theme is logical and convincing. He has repro-

duced the usual proofs of our Lord's divinity in popular form, clothed in simple idiomatic English. No honest believer in the authority of sacred Scripture can resist the conclusion that is set forth in *The Separated Life*.

The title, it seems to us, is somewhat misleading. To the average reader the words, "the separated life" refer to what is often called "the consecrated life," the life of earnest faith and sacrifice, the life of the true believer, rather than to the life of Jesus. Moreover, in a very real sense the life of Jesus was not a life of separation from men.

The book is worthy of the subject and deserves a wide circulation. Its perusal will confirm the faith of many and save that of others from shipwreck. It would be a good thing if some generous Christian would emulate the liberality of a wealthy Unitarian who distributes gratuitously some of the writings of his sect. It would be well if his people were permitted to read *The Separated Life*.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO. BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

The Christian Philosophy of Life. Sermons preached in the Dartmouth College Church by Samuel Penniman Leeds, Pastor 1860-1900. Pp. 298.

The fact that a preacher was able to hold the same pulpit for forty years, and this, too, in a college town and in a college church, is evidence of unusual grace of character and pulpit power. These sermons, nineteen in number, give ample proof of both of these. They are thoughtful, suggestive and stimulating, and must have been helpful to the young men who heard them, as well as to the general congregation. Yet in reading them one misses that strong evangelical touch which ought to characterize all preaching, and especially sermons addressed to the young. The prevailing tone is moral rather than spiritual. Jesus is presented as a teacher and example rather than as a Savior. Possibly an extract from the author's preface to the volume will explain and also account for what we mean. "In my view less needs to be said to sceptics than might be supposed. Rather would I remind them of the four anchors. In Paul's shipwreck the seamen 'cast four anchors out of the stern and wished for day.' Genuine respect—and any religion deserves more or less of that, be it Mohammedan, Brahmanic, or Buddhist—prompt obedience to know and knowable duty, service to one's fellowmen, and profound reverence for Christ—however conceived metaphysically, these will hold the ship."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE LUTHER PRESS. MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Luther's Epistle Sermons. Epiphany, Easter and Pentecost, translated with the help of others by Prof. John Nicholas Lenker, D.D., author of "Lutherans in All Lands," translator of Luther's Works into English, etc., Volume 2, (Volume 8 of Luther's Complete Works.) Third thousand. 1909.

If genius is to be defined as a capacity for hard work, then Doctor Lenker has earned the title of a literary genius. He continues to place the American Lutheran Church under increasing obligation by steadily adding to the English volumes of Luther's Works translated into this, the official language of America. The colossal undertaking is being gradually accomplished, ten volumes having already been received by those so fortunate as to have subscribed for the set.

It would be a superfluous work to attempt to commend the classic work of the great Luther as a preacher.

The sermons embraced in this volume emphasize the evangelizing revision of the Gospel, based on the Epistles for the cycle of the church year from Epiphany to Pentecost.

Dr. Lenker's dedication is appropriate:

"To All, Pastors and Laymen, who appreciate the true place of Luther's writings in the evangelization of Europe, and are interested in the evangelization of the world, this volume of Easter and Pentecost Epistle Sermons of the English Luther is gratefully and prayerfully dedicated."

THE QUARTERLY urges upon every American Lutheran pastor the decided advisability of obtaining this volume, those which have preceded it and those which shall follow. To Dr. Lenker we extend our cordial congratulations upon the distinguished service which he is thus sending to the entire Church and the credit he is thus reflecting upon the branch of his own origin.

F. G. GOTWALD.

Luther's Small Catechism, Christian Educational Series—Book One.

Luther's Large Catechism, Christian Educational Series—Book Two.

Luther's Two Catechisms Explained by himself in six classic writings. All of these translated, with the help of others, by Prof. John Nicholas Lenker, D.D. The first two are bound in one volume, and the third in one volume. Price 50 cents each. Cloth.

It is doubtful whether the world will ever outlive Luther's Small Catechism. It is so simple, so Scriptural and so vital in its contents that it may be called a little Bible. Probably no other book, the Bible alone excepted, has been so widely circulated, so frequently printed and translated as this little Catechism. Its character is so well known to all readers of THE QUARTERLY that nothing need be said in commendation of it.

Luther's Large Catechism, as the name indicates, is practically an enlargement, by way of discussion, of the Small Catechism. It was intended originally for the clergy, as the latter was for the laity. While never as generally circulated as the latter, the Large Catechism is well worth perusal, as all the writings of Luther are.

The Six Classic Writings by which the two Catechisms are explained are "The Law, Faith and Prayer," "The Three Universal Creeds," "The Lord's Prayer Explained," "Sermon on Holy Baptism," "Instruction on Confession," and "Benefits of the Lord's Supper."

We are always impressed in reading Luther's writings with their wonderful vitality and power. They were all brought out by the pressing needs of the day rather than by the mere desire of writing. They are always worth reading by all, ministers and laity.

Luther anticipated the pedagogical ideas which are now being so earnestly insisted on. He was an ideal teacher, knowing his subject and understanding the nature of the child as few have.

Dr. Lenker deserves much credit for bringing these little but great books within the reach of all interested.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

The Wonderful Story of Life and Death, as written in the Books of Nature and Revelation. By Rev. Matthew G. Boyer, D.D. Cloth. Pp. 390.

We commend Dr. Boyer's book for its plainness and thoughtfulness. It deals with great and vital truths—man's origin, life and destiny. It is written in the devout spirit of a sincere Christian who believes the Scriptures as the truest history, the profoundest philosophy and the only way to life everlasting. He may not always succeed in reconciling the two Books. No man has done so fully yet. Nevertheless, he shows that there can be no contradiction.

The statement is hardly in accordance with fact when the author says, "Scientists generally regard these six days of creation as

long periods of time, but theologians, as a general rule, look upon them as six natural days." The fact is that as a general rule modern theologians regard the six days as long periods of time.

The author is more fortunate in dealing with purely theological truth. Here he is at home and sets forth the old doctrine in a fresh manner.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Rational Test. Bible Doctrine in the Light of Reason. By Leander S. Keyser, D.D., Author of "In Bird Land," etc. Cloth, 12 mo. Pp. viii. 189. Price 75 cents.

The author of this admirable little volume defines his viewpoint as follows: "To show that certain fundamental Biblical doctrines as held by orthodox believers, are reasonable—that is the chief purpose of this volume. The author's position is that reason should not be placed above the Bible; that is rationalism."

The eleven chapters of this treatise cover in a sense the whole subject of theology: Introduction, God, Man, Christ, The Holy Spirit, and The Last Things.

The discussions are necessarily brief, coming from the pen of a busy, thoughtful pastor rather than from a trained theologian. They are, nevertheless, clear, simple and helpful, and reflect much credit on their author.

The opening chapter entitled "The Rationale of Theism," discusses some of the false conceptions of the universe. Over against anti-theistic evolution, it is maintained that "involution is inscribed everywhere no less distinctly" than evolution. "Nothing in nature was ever evolved that had not previously been involved." No product of nature can surpass the potency with which it must have been endowed. Consciousness could not evolve itself out of unconsciousness.

The author is a firm believer in "the plenary inspiration of the Bible." The Bible not only contains the Word of God, but is the Word of God. This being settled, all the deductions following are logical.

Dr. Keyser has given the Church a wholesome book which ought to be placed by pastors in the hands of honest skeptics, as well as intelligent believers. The thought is clearly expressed in simple diction. This will make the book acceptable where a technical work would not be read. We commend it heartily.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

G. E. STECHERT CO. NEW YORK.

Testimonium Animae, or Greek and Roman before Jesus Christ.

By E. G. Sihler, Ph.D. Price \$2.25.

This "series of essays dealing with the spiritual elements in classical civilization" is a very suggestive presentation of what the Greek and the Roman before Jesus Christ thought on the problems which affect the mind and heart of man most profoundly. It is the author's plan to allow the thinkers to speak for themselves. He has consequently given us a rich compilation of their choicest sayings. He writes from the Christian standpoint, and his work has a considerable apologetic strain. The soul bears witness of its noble origin and its high destiny. The Greek and the Roman show how man, left to himself, gropes but poorly towards higher things. Even Socrates, who called "the pursuit of wisdom down from the vaulted firmament" could see only ignorance in Theodote the Courtesan—by the side of this the penitent Magdalene forgiven presents a contrast which shows the sublime elevation of the Divine Christ as against the moral philosopher.

The author, after thirty-five years of special study of the literature of this period, finds many points at which to take issue with archeologists and professional historians, especially those of the Hegelian school. Zeller and Mommsen are too much absorbed by their theory of history to be historical, and, as for Mahaffy, he "is endured painfully by those who read Greek for themselves." These criticisms are uniformly brief and severe, perhaps too severe for the best interests of the author's own purposes. However, the careful reader of this work will be slow to yield to Humanism and Classicism that high devotion which characterizes Positivists of every sort. He will be strengthened in his appreciation of the Divine in Christianity, and he will be furnished with first hand evidence against any explanation of Christ and Christianity as either inferior religiosity or mere ethical evolution. The spirit of the book will become evident from a single sentence taken from preface: "This book is written in the full conviction that man is endowed with an immortal soul and with a transcendent responsibility of conscience and conduct,.....and that man's personality is the highest thing in nature known to us, and that all efforts to beastialize man by any form of physical or zoological hypothesis must prove futile in the end."

The book is not a systematic treatise, but rather a presentation of the best which the uninspired great thinkers of antiquity thought—the *Testimonium Animae* of the natural man, in a

way which places "the absolute and divine worth of revealed religion" in beautiful contrast.

C. F. SANDERS.

EATON & MAINS. NEW YORK.

Sacerdotalism in the Nineteenth Century, A Critical History

By Henry C. Sheldon, Professor in Boston University. Cloth, 8 mo. Pp. ix, 461. Price \$2.00 net.

The historical and doctrinal studies of Dr. Sheldon gave him a peculiar fitness for the authorship of the important volume before us. It is thoroughly critical, being based upon authoritative documents or reliable citations from them. Nevertheless, it is also plain and practical. Its object is first to set forth history, and secondly to warn the present generation against the destructive character and effect of sacerdotalism at the present day.

By sacerdotalism Dr. Sheldon means "the profound emphasis on priestly authority and on sacramental efficacy. The name is indicative of the system which exalts the office of the priestly hierarchy and the virtue of the rites supposed to depend for their valid administration upon that hierarchy." In short it is that system against which the Reformation was directed and which indeed made the Reformation a necessity. Sacerdotalism was scotched but not killed in the sixteenth century. Dr. Sheldon gives it as his opinion that "the spirit, purpose, and action of priestly hierarchies were never surcharged more deeply than at present with an intense hatred of that evangelical teaching which emphasizes the freedom and responsibility of the individual in the sphere of religious belief and practice."

It is the task of the volume to set this forth and thus to equip the evangelical teacher and pastor to defend the faith by rational means. Too frequently the pastor is at loss to substantiate his charges against Romanism for lack of information.

The matter is set forth in two parts, the first dealing with "the Roman Type" of Sacerdotalism, and the second with "Greek, Anglican, and other Types."

Under the first heading are discussed "The Principle of Ecclesiastical Authority," "Papal Absolutism," "Some Features of the Sacramental System" and "The Outlook for Roman Sacerdotalism." In this discussion are set forth the relation between Church and State, and the questions of Personal Rights and Liberties. These topics are of the most vital importance to every man, especially to the American. The claims of Papal supremacy and infallibility are set forth in all their arrogance and successfully refuted. The fallacy of the sacramental system is also exposed.

The possibility of the existence of such a monumental mass of errors is often a surprise to the Protestant. It must not be forgotten, however, that the Romish system is not unmingled error. The Catholic accepts much that the Protestant believes. The persistence of the system depends, as Dr. Sheldon thinks, upon three things: first, "a high pressure of sentimental devotion;" secondly, "a steadfast and comprehensive employment of patronage in its behalf;" and thirdly, "a radical scheme of intellectual surveillance and restriction." How long these can be maintained in the light of modern progress no man may predict. That they can not last perpetually seems a certainty.

The character of Greek Sacerdotalism is only less absurd and erroneous than the Roman. At times some of its doctrinal writers have approached Protestantism, only to be repressed. Its errors, however, are less dangerous because of the comparative ignorance of its adherents.

The Anglo-Catholic movement, known also as "Tractarianism," "Ritualism," and the "Oxford Movement," is treated with fulness and fairness. Its history is traced from its genesis to the present day. It is shown how it has often led to Rome, as in the case of the illustrious Newman, and how its logical end is Romanism. It occupies the contradictory attitude of leaning toward Rome and yet denying it. The author expresses the hope that historical and philosophical studies will exercise a leavening influence in the Church of England and enable it to realize its own splendid possibilities.

The minor examples of Sacerdotalism are the abortive efforts of a few Neo-Lutherans, of the Irvingites, and of the Mormons.

That the author does not mean to condemn liturgical forms of worship is apparent from the following quotation. "It is worth considering whether a further demand does not rest upon evangelical Protestantism, namely, the demand to bestow increased study upon the problem of edifying forms of worship. Thoughtful people will hardly come to deny that it is a matter of very considerable importance to bring Protestant worship as near as possible to the happy mean between excessive plainness and a burdensome superfluity of forms. A legitimate motive to incline to the side of plainness may exist where there is a liability that forms should be regarded superstitiously. But when once ceremonial has been divorced from all connection with magic and theurgy, and has come to be rated simply as a means of expressing the subject-matter of faith by emblematic act or symbol, liberty in its use will properly be limited only by the extent to which it can be made useful in impressing truth."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

FUNK & WAGNAL'S CO. NEW YORK. PERIODICALS.

The Literary Digest. A weekly magazine. Pp. 43 each. Vol. xxxviii. Pp. 1126. January-June. Price \$3.00 a year in advance.

If a man were able to subscribe for only one paper we know of none, except probably his denominational religious paper, which we could more heartily recommend than *The Literary Digest*. Its departments are Topics of the Day, Foreign Comment, Science and Invention, The Religious World, and Letters and Art. Under these several headings are grouped articles, selected and original, giving fresh and comprehensive information. The reader who faithfully peruses them, keeps in touch with all the great social, political, scientific, literary, artistic, and religious movements of his age at home and abroad. For instance, the number for the last week in June contains articles on The President's Corporation Tax, Cold Water on the Waterways Project, Wall Street, An American Holiday, The Philippines, German Predominance in Europe, Socialism in Persia, Water-tight Compartments in Ships, How to Drive a Nail. Professor Foster, Mrs. Eddy, etc., etc.

The Missionary Review of the World... An illustrated monthly magazine of missionary methods, problems, biography and history. Each number contains 80 pages, 8 vo. Price \$2.50 a year.

This is the most comprehensive missionary periodical extant. It is a veritable Acts of the Apostles in mission lands. No other publication covers the same ground. It is indispensable to a knowledge of the progress of the kingdom abroad. Every reading room and every minister who desires to be abreast of the times should have it. The average minister does not preach frequently enough on the subject of foreign missions, and the reason in many cases is because he has no fresh, stirring information. The Review furnishes ammunition and inspiration for scores of interesting sermons.

